IN THE SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI

THE SOLITE	IL COOK! OF WIS	SSISSIPPI
PAGES NUMBERED 77 -	1920	VOLUME 20of 2
		EXHIBIT
	ELEC	TRONIC DISK
	Case #200	04-DP-00738-SCT
COURT APPEALED FROM : Circui	it Court	
COUNTY: Montgomery		
TRIAL JUDGE : C. E. Morgan III		
Curtis Giovanni Flowers v. Sta	te of Mississipp	
=======================================		
Betty W. S	Sephton, Clerk	

TRIAL COURT #: 2003-0071-CR

Roy Harris - CROSS

Evans had to move up in order to do that, and he had to speak louder in order for this man to respond, according to the own witness. So the objection is not well taken. It's overruled.

BY MR. EVANS: May I--

BY THE COURT: -- Do not argue with him though or badger him, Mr. Evans.

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. May I proceed, Your Honor?

BY THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. Do you remember further saying that after y'all saw the person the second time up around 51, that you took

 Clemmie over to her mother's house?
 - A. No, sir. I didn't say nothing like that.
 - Q. You can't read; is that right?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. Mr. Harris, I want to make sure I understand you. You are admitting that on at least two different occasions, one that Mr. Johnson was there and one that he was not there, that you have given statements that as y'all were going down Church Street, Clemmie Fleming said, "There goes Curtis Flowers"; is that right?
- A. That's what Clemmie Fleming said. But I didn't witness to it. All I, I got out of the office because he had made me mad, and I didn't want to witness. He didn't want to hear what I had to say, but he wanted me to witness to what Clemmie Fleming said.
 - Q. At a hearing did you not say that under oath?

	1772
1	Roy Harris - CROSS - REDIRECT A. What's that now?
2	Q. At a hearing did you not say that under oath?
3	A. (Very softly) I don't know where that at.
4	Q. You know what I'm talking about, don't you?
5	A. (Witness shakes his head.)
6	Q. Have you ever taken an oath to tell the truth and
7	said that Clemmie Fleming said, "There goes Curtis Flowers"?
8	A. I say I thought she said something like that. I
9	didn't say she said, "There goes Curtis Flowers."
10	BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I don't have any
11	further questions of this witness.
12	BY THE WITNESS:
13	A. Because I didn't have no hearing aid on or nothing
14	like that, and if Mr. Johnson, if how come I had to
15	hitchhike back home?
16	BY THE COURT: Mr. Carter.
17	(Defense Counsel confer.)
18	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CARTER:
19	Q. Mr. Harris, you did not see Curtis Flowers running;
20	is that correct?
21	A. No, sir. I sure haven't.
22	Q. This is Curtis Flowers right here. You did not see
23	this man running; is that correct?
24	A. (Witness shakes his head.) Well, I can say one
25	thing.
26	BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I would ask
27	BY THE WITNESS:if it was Mr. Flowers
28	BY MR. EVANS:that he be responsive to the

29

questions.

	Miles Magrannin PIREGE
1	Mike McSparrin - DIRECT BY MR. CARTER: Stop.
2	BY THE COURT: He needs to answer your question.
3	Then he can explain it.
4	BY MR. CARTER: One moment.
5	(Defense Counsel confer.)
6	BY MR. CARTER: No further questions, Your Honor.
7	You can go, Mr. Harris.
8	BY THE COURT: You are free to go, Mr. Harris.
9	BY THE WITNESS: I can go?
10	BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.
11	WITNESS EXCUSED.
12	BY THE COURT: Who will you have next?
13	BY MR. CARTER: Mike McSparrin. Oh, one minute.
14	I have one more before him if she is here.
15	(Mr. Carter leaves the courtroom briefly and
16	returns.)
17	BY MR. CARTER: Mike McSparrin, Your Honor.
18	MIKE MCSPARRIN,
19	a white male called to testify as a witness by the Defendant,
20	having first been duly sworn, testified as follows, to-wit:
21	BY THE COURT: Have a seat up here, sir. State
22	your name.
23	BY THE WITNESS: Mike McSparrin. That is spelled
24	M C S P A R R I N.
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CARTER:
26	Q. Okay, Mr. McSparrin, where do you work presently?
27	A. I work for the Criminal Information Center,
28	Department of Public Safety.
29	Q. And where did you work in 1996?

		·
	Wilson Magne	1774
1	A.	arrin - DIRECT In 1996, I was employed by the Mississippi State
2	Crime Lab	oratory.
3	Q.	In what capacity?
4	Α.	I was a certified latent print examiner.
5	Q.	Fingerprint examiner; is that the same thing?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	Now could you tell us something about your
8	education	al background?
9		BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I will stipulate that
10	he	is an expert in the field of fingerprints.
11		BY MR. CARTER: Okay.
12		BY THE COURT: I accept him as an expert in that
13	fi	eld.
14	BY MR. CA	RTER:
15	Q.	Did you have the occasion to do some work on a case
16	involving	the State of Mississippi versus Curtis Flowers?
17	A.	Yes, I did.
18	Q.	Can you tell us what you were asked to do and what
19	you did?	
20	Α.	Well, as a latent print examiner, there was some
21	evidence	from the crime scene that I was asked to examine in
22	this part	icular case.
23	Q.	Okay. Can you, do you have your file with you?
24	Δ	Ves I do

- Q. Can you be more specific in terms of what you were asked to do and what you did?
- BY THE WITNESS: Your Honor, if I could go to my notes?

BY THE COURT: Yes.

25

26

Mike McSparrin - DIRECT BY THE WITNESS:

- A. Specifically, I was asked to look at some latent lifts that came from a crime scene, and I was also asked to process some evidence, some casings, and a shoe box and a bank bag and a bank receipt book.
- Q. And did you find any fingerprints or any evidence that connected Mr. Flowers to this crime?
 - A. No.

BY MR. CARTER: One moment.

(Defense Counsel confer.)

- Q. Could you tell the jury what it is you do to determine -- when you get lifts that come to you, do you know whether or not they are already prints that -- explain what it is you get or receive?
- A. Well, in this particular case, I received some lifts that were taken at the scene by crime scene investigator. These lifts were submitted to me. I evaluate them to see if there is any fingerprints, latent prints of value on these lifts, and once I make this determination, I label them, number them.
 - Q. Did you find any latent prints of value?
- A. On the lifts from the crime scene, yes, I did. There were six. I labeled them L-1 through L-6.
- Q. Okay, and you got latent prints of value, I believe, from a shoe box too; is that correct?
- A. Yes, I did. I processed -- the shoe box was submitted as a piece of evidence, and I processed that shoe box to see if I could develop some latent prints on that shoe box.

Mike McSparrin - DIRECT

- Q. And did you also receive some known prints?
- A. Yes, I did.

- Q. -- that were used for comparison?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Whose prints were those? Well, strike that. Did you receive known prints from the Defendant?
 - A. Curtis Flowers?
 - Q. Yes.
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And you were able to take the known prints versus the unknown prints you had and make some comparisons; is that correct?
- A. I did conduct a comparison between the two; yes, I did.
- Q. Okay, and you didn't find Mr. Flowers' prints on anything that you examined; is that correct?
 - A. There was -- no identification was effected.
 - Q. Okay. One moment.
 - (Defense Counsel confer.)
- Q. Now is it true that with respect to individuals, that we all have or supposedly have different, I guess, or unique prints; is that correct?
- A. That is correct. No two individuals ever have been found to have the same fingerprints. That is correct.
- Q. And when you are looking at fingerprints, you examine the starts, stops and the dots within the, I guess a person's fingers or hands?
- A. The identification characteristics located on the friction ridge skin of an individual's hands or on the bottom

Mike McSparrin - DIRECT - CROSS of their feet.

- Q. Or on the bottom of their feet. Now with respect to a shoe box like that, is that a good object to contain fingerprints?
 - A. That was an excellent piece of evidence, yes.
- Q. Now how long does prints last? Is there any life of, as far as you know, of a print?
- A. Scientifically, there is no way to age a latent print that can be left on a surface.

BY MR. CARTER: We tender.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. Good morning, Mr. McSparrin.
- A. Good morning.
- Q. Have you been advised of what type of business this was?
 - A. Where the crime scene took place?
- Q. Yes, sir.
 - A. Other than just in my notes, a furniture store to my knowledge.
 - Q. Okay. And is that the type of place you would expect a lot of people to come in and handle things?
 - A. Retail, I would expect a lot of people to come in if they are shopping, yes.
 - Q. Have you also been advised that the Defendant was an employee there?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. So you would expect his prints to have been in the store somewhere anyway, wouldn't you?
 - A. He has legitimate access to the facility, yes.

1778 Mike McSparrin - CROSS Just like the victims in this case? 1 2 Α. Yes. Now were the officers' prints that handled the shoe 3 Ο. box submitted to you? 4 5 Α. No, they were not. Okay, so you don't know if the few prints that you 6 got off of there were the officers or not? 7 No, I do not. 8 Α. 9 Now where you have got a business and an employee is the suspect, do prints make much difference to you if you 10 11 find prints in an open place? It depends on the circumstances. If let's say you 12 found prints in blood, yes, that could have a bearing. Yes, 13 14 it could. Okay, but just on the counter, things like that? 15 Q. 16 If they have legitimate access, they could have 17 handled it at any time. 18 BY MR. EVANS: Nothing further, Your Honor. BY MR. CARTER: One moment, Your Honor. 19 20 (Defense Counsel confer.) 21 BY MR. CARTER: No more questions. 22 BY THE COURT: All right, is he finally excused? 23 BY MR. CARTER: Yes. 24 BY THE COURT: You are free to go, sir. 25 BY THE WITNESS: Thank you.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

BY THE COURT: Who do you have next?

26

27

28

29

BY MR. CARTER: Let me see, Your Honor, if this other person showed up.

Bench Conference (Mr. Carter leaves the courtroom briefly and 1 2 returns.) BY MR. CARTER: Your Honor, one second. 3 (Defense Counsel confer followed by CONFERENCE AT 4 THE BENCH OUT OF THE HEARING OF THE JURY AS FOLLOWS:) 5 BY MR. CARTER: Well, Your Honor, I'm scared, I'm 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

reluctant to say this because you have asked us have we wanted you to force people to be here and we said no. We have another witness named Stacy Wright who is a student at Ole Miss. And apparently she is not here, and we don't know if she is on her way or what the situation is. I was wondering if the Court could give us five minutes or ten minutes just to call and see where she is. And if she is not here in a small amount of time, we will just have to forget about it even though we want her.

BY THE COURT: Okay, I'm going to take a short break to let you do that, but I want the record to reflect that her name was mentioned to me yesterday. I asked if she had been subpoenaed, and she was subpoenaed and served. My understanding is - correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Carter - but you released her; is that right?

No. Well, she never actually BY MR. CARTER: showed up in the first place and we--

BY THE COURT: Did you bring that to the Court's attention?

BY MR. CARTER: No, sir. I didn't.

BY THE COURT: The Defense announced ready at the

Randy Keenum - DIRECT beginning of this trial. That means that they are 1 responsible for their witnesses. As of yesterday, I 2 knew about this witness, knew she had been subpoenaed, 3 and offered to issue an attachment for that witness. 4 The Defense declined that offer, and with the 5 understanding that she would be here today. I will 6 give you the five or ten minutes to find out what the 7 situation is, but if she is not on the way or -- well, 8 I will wait to evaluate it when you tell me what the 9 deal is, but we have got to go forward. Okay? 10 BY MR. CARTER: Yes, sir. 11 END BENCH CONFERENCE. 12 BY THE COURT: We will take a short break, ladies 13 14 and gentlemen. (FOLLOWING A TWENTY MINUTE RECESS, THE TRIAL 15 16 RESUMED IN OPEN COURT WITH ALL COUNSEL, THE DEFENDANT, AND THE JURY PRESENT:) 17 BY THE COURT: Who will you have next? 18 BY MR. CARTER: Your Honor, we rest. 19 DEFENDANT RESTS. 20 BY THE COURT: Okay. Rebuttal? 21 22 BY MR. EVANS: Randy Keenum will be first, Your Honor. 23 RANDY KEENUM, 24 a white male called to testify as a witness by the State of 25 26 Mississippi IN REBUTTAL, having first been duly sworn, testified as follows, to-wit: 27

BY THE COURT: State your name, please.

29 **BY THE WITNESS:** Randy Keenum.

1781 Randy Keenum - DIRECT BY THE COURT REPORTER: Spell your last name. 1 BY MR. EVANS: Good morning--2 BY THE COURT: --Wait just a second. She needs 3 4 him to spell it. BY THE WITNESS: KEENUN. 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS: Good morning, Mr. Keenum. 7 Q. 8 Α. Good morning. Mr. Keenum, where do you work? 9 Q. At this time I work for Bennett's Transport. Α. 10 I want to direct your attention back to July of 11 Q. 12 1996, and I will ask you where you worked at that time? For Angelica. 13 Α. 14 Q. For Angelica? Yes, sir. 15 Α. 16 If you would, speak up just a little bit. Q. All right. 17 Α. What hours did you work there? 18 Q. Oh, I opened the plant up about 6:30 until 3 19 Α. 20 o'clock in the afternoon. 21 I want to direct your attention specifically to the Q. 22 day of the murders at Tardy Furniture. Do you remember that day? 23 24 Yes, sir. Α. Do you know a person by the name of Doyle Simpson? 25 Q.

Q. Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury where he was from say 9:20 that morning until 10:20 that morning?

Yes, sir.

Α.

26

27

28

Randy Keenum - DIRECT - CROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. Yes, sir. We always took break at 9:20. The plant had two breaks. We weren't on production, so we usually took more than one. So we usually took break from about 9:20 until a quarter to 10:00. And then we would go back to work.

- Q. Okay. And that particular morning, do you know where Doyle Simpson was from 9:20 until say 10:20?
 - A. Yes, sir. He was there at the plant.
 - Q. He was at Angelica?
 - A. Yes, sir.

BY MR. EVANS: Nothing further, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CARTER:

- Q. Mr. Keenum, had you given Mr. Evans or Mr. Johnson or anybody a statement before regarding your testimony today?
- A. No, not a statement. I have talked to them, you know, whenever all this happened, but not really a statement.
 - Q. Okay, when did you talk to them?
 - A. Oh, after the murders.
 - O. When after the murders?
- A. The day, I don't know. You know, it was several days after it.
 - Q. Now who did you give the statement to?
 - A. I talked to John.
 - O. John Johnson?
- A. Johnson.
- 25 | Q. Did John Johnson have a tape recorder running?
- 26 A. No.
- Q. Did he make any notes?
- 28 A. I don't know.
- Q. What do you do at Angelica? What did you do at

Randy Keenum - CROSS Angelica?

1 Angelica?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. Maintenance. I was in the maintenance end of it.
- Q. You was in the maintenance area?
- A. Uh-hum.
- Q. And tell me what you did all that day?
- A. All that day?
- Q. All that day. How long did you work? What was your hours that day?
 - A. From 6:30 to 3 o'clock.
 - Q. What did you do at 6:30 when you got there?
- A. I opened the door, went in, turned on the lights, cranked up the air compressors, the boiler, the vacuum.
 - Q. Okay, that is something you routinely do? Is that--
 - A. -- every day.
- Q. What did you do after you did that on that particular day.
- A. Usually I would get a Mountain Dew and drink it every morning.
 - Q. Did you get a Mountain Dew that day?
- A. Oh, I am sure I did.
 - Q. Okay. And what did you do after the Mountain Dew?
- A. If there was any machines left over, you know, from the day before that were broke, I would go out and start fixing on those.
 - Q. Okay, how many machines were left open that day?
- A. I don't know exactly. Usually we tried to get them all, but sometimes it would be two or three.
 - Q. How many machines did you fix that day?

Randy Keenum - CROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- A. Oh, I can't tell you that.
- Q. What did you do after possibly looking at the machines?
- A. By that time the ladies was there. We went to work. You know, they went to work. The supervisors come up, rolled up the machines, and we, you know -- myself and Reverend Johnny Butts and Kenny Johnson, you know, we worked on the sewing machines.
 - Q. On the sewing machines?
 - A. Yeah, it was a sewing factory.
 - Q. Is that what you did almost every day?
- A. No, that's what I did every day. That was my job, you know.
 - Q. What did Doyle Simpson have on that day?
 - A. I don't know. I can't tell you that. I don't have a clue. But I know we sat there and ate, you know.
 - Q. What did he eat?
 - A. What did he eat?
 - Q. Yes.
- 20 I don't know. His mother always fixed him a plate. 21 I don't, you know, I don't know. I probably, more than 22 likely, I would more than likely eat like a pop tart or 23 something like that, and Doyle always had a meal. You know, 24 it's a home cooked meal. You know, this is not something we 25 did occasionally. We took break together every day. I mean 26 you know, we took a break in the shop. We didn't go up there 27 where the ladies was. We had our own little refrigerator and 28 our own microwave in the shop. We would come in; we would 29 sit down; and we would eat, take break, laugh, joke,

Randy Keenum - CROSS
whatever. And the ladies would go back to work. Well, you
know, we didn't have to because we weren't fighting
production, so we would sit back there and have a good time
more or less.

- Q. How long did y'all break that day?
- A. The break started at 9:20 because we had a buzzer that went off. And we was probably quarter to 10:00 or so. We went back and I went to work, and Doyle went back to sweeping floors. I know that because I saw him sweeping the floor.
 - Q. Now do you read and write?
- 12 A. Yes.

- Q. Did Mr. Johnson ask you to write out a statement about what you saw?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Did he even ask you if you could read and write?
- A. No. I assumed that he knew I could read and write.

 I don't know. I meant -- I will be glad to tell him now if
 you need me to.

BY MR. CARTER: One minute.

(Defense Counsel confer.)

- Q. Mr. Keenum, where did you talk to John Johnson at? Where were you?
- A. I believe I come and met him at the police department here in town, which it was over by Oliver's Funeral Home at that time.
 - Q. Are you sure?
 - A. I am pretty well positive.
- Q. How long were you there?

Randy Keenum - CROSS

A. I don't know that. John and I have been friends a long time. I imagine we -- you know, I don't know; we just talked.

- Q. He is your friend? Okay, what did you have on that day that you gave that statement to Mr. Johnson? You don't remember?
- A. I am sure it was Levi blue jeans because that's all I ever wear, but other than that, I can't tell you about it.
 - Q. Okay. What exactly did Mr. Johnson ask you?
- A. Exactly? Seems like it was did I remember Doyle being at the plant.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. I told him yeah -- yeah, that we took break together.
 - Q. Okay, how long did you break that day?
- A. The same. It was probably, it was about like from 9:20 -- like I say, we had a buzzer that went off. I was always in the shop at 9:20, take a break and eat and sit there and laugh and all. If a truck driver or something come in, probably a quarter to 10:00 or maybe ten minutes to 10:00, something like that, I probably got up and went back out there and went to work. I was riding the clock. You know, I'm not going to sit here and tell you no lie.
- Q. So you have to -- when you take your break, you clock out?
 - A. No.
 - Q. How long are your breaks?
- A. Ten minutes is what the ladies got. They got from 9:20 to 9:30. It was like half of the plant got that, you

1	Randy Keenum - CROSS know. Okay, this half went back to work. The buzzer went
2	off, you know. This bunch here come in, and they got ten
3	minutes off.
4	Q. So the breaks are normally ten minutes for
5	everybody?
6	A. Right. The ladies were on production. You know,
7	they didn't want to be off over ten minutes because
8	Q What about Doyle?
9	A. Oh, no, Doyle was like us. He was working by the
10	hour.
11	Q. Okay, so y'all didn't have no
12	A. (Witness shakes his head.)
13	Q. Did y'all clock in? Did you have to clock in when
14	you get there in morning?
15	A. Yeah, well, we wrote it in. We didn't punch a
16	clock.
17	Q. Okay, but you wrote it in so that they would know
18	that you were there?
19	A. Right. Yes, on a time clock, sure did.
20	BY MR. CARTER: One moment. I think I'm
21	finished.
22	(Defense Counsel confer.)
23	BY MR. CARTER: No further questions, Your Honor
24	BY MR. EVANS: Nothing further, Your Honor. We
25	would ask that he be released.
26	BY THE COURT: You are free to go.
27	BY THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
28	WITNESS EXCUSED.

BY MR. EVANS: Jack Matthews.

	Jack Matthews - DIRECT
1	JACK MATTHEWS,
2	a white male recalled to testify by the State of Mississippi,
3	this time in REBUTTAL, having been previously sworn,
4	testified again as follows, to-wit:
5	BY THE COURT: State your name, please, sir.
6	BY THE WITNESS: Jack Matthews.
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:
8	Q. For the record, you are the same Jack Matthews that
9	has previously testified in this case; is that correct?
10	A. Yes, sir.
11	Q. Mr. Matthews, you have testified earlier that the
12	shoes you took off of the Defendant Curtis Flowers were size
13	10 1/2; is that correct?
14	A. Yes, sir.
15	Q. Do you have those shoes here with you today?
16	A. Yes, sir. I do.
17	Q. Would you produce them, please.
18	A. (Witness complies.)
19	BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, may I have this
20	exhibit marked for identification?
21	BY THE COURT: Yes.
22	(SACK CONTAINING NIKE TENNIS SHOES WAS MARKED AS
23	STATE'S EXHIBIT S-125 FOR IDENTIFICATION, and they were shown
24	to Defense Counsel.)
25	BY MR. EVANS:
26	Q. Mr. Matthews, Exhibit 125, is this the shoes that
27	you took from the Defendant that showed they were size ten

and a half's?

Yes, sir.

28

	Jack Matthews - DIRECT
1	BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I offer this Exhibit
2	125 into evidence.
3	BY MR. CARTER: Your Honor, we object. We didn'
4	see any size on them.
5	BY THE WITNESS: I will show you.
6	BY MR. EVANS: We will cover that in a minute,
7	but at this point I am offering them into evidence
8	because they are the shoes he took from him
9	BY MR. CARTER: No objection other than that.
10	BY THE COURT: Okay. That objection is
11	overruled. Let them be admitted.
12	(SACK CONTAINING NIKE SHOES PREVIOUSLY MARKED AS
13	STATE'S EXHIBIT S-125 FOR IDENTIFICATION WAS NOW RECEIVED IN
14	EVIDENCE.)
15	BY MR. EVANS:
16	Q. I will hand you Exhibit 125 back, and I will ask
17	you if these shoes have the size marked in them?
18	A. Yes, sir. They do.
19	Q. Would you pull one of them out so that you can sho
20	the jury what the size is in the shoe.
21	BY MR. EVANS: May the witness step down, Your
22	Honor?
23	BY THE COURT: Yes.
24	BY MR. EVANS:
25	Q. If you would, show the jury where the size is and
26	what the size in that shoe is.
27	A. Okay. You have got a tag right down here in the
28	shoe.

You can step up closer to the jury box if you would

29

Q.

Jack Matthews - DIRECT 1 like to. 2 You have this tag right here in the shoe, and it Α. shows 10.5, which means 10 1/2 US shoe. 3 If you would, before we pass it, walk down to where 4 the other jurors can see where you are pointing to. 5 (Witness complies.) Both shoes have this tag in 6 7 them. All right. Q. 8 9 BY MR. CARTER: Let me see it. BY MR. EVANS: May I pass this exhibit to the 10 jury, Your Honor? 11 BY THE COURT: It has been admitted. You can. 12 Has it been marked? 13 BY MR. EVANS: The composite exhibit has been 14 15 marked, the bag with the two shoes in it. I am just passing one of the shoes that was in the exhibit 16 17 instead of passing the whole bag, with the Court's 18 approval. 19 BY THE COURT: Why don't we mark those exhibits 20 the way we did those others. 21 BY MR. EVANS: All right, sir. 22 BY THE COURT: As S--23 BY MR. EVANS: As A and B? 24 BY THE COURT: A and B, yeah. 25 (LEFT NIKE TENNIS SHOE WAS MARKED AS STATE'S EXHIBIT S-125A AND THE RIGHT SHOE AS S-125B, BOTH IN 26

BY MR. EVANS: All right, Your Honor, Exhibit 125A, I will pass to the jury.

27

28

29

EVIDENCE.)

	1791
1	Jack Matthews - CROSS - REDIRECT BY THE COURT: Okay.
2	BY MR. EVANS: And I will tender this witness.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CARTER:
4	Q. Mr. Matthews, where did you obtain those shoes from
5	Mr. Flowers? Where were you when you obtained them?
6	A. At the Winona Police Department.
7	Q. Are those the only ones you obtained?
8	A. I believe we obtained another pair from his
9	residence.
10	Q. Okay. Now you are saying that you got a pair of
11	ten and a half shoes from Mr. Flowers. But can you also say
12	that you know for a fact that Mr. Flowers didn't have or
13	purchase any shoes that were size 11 also? Are you saying
14	A The only shoes I know anything about are the
15	ones that we got off his feet here.
16	Q. Okay, so it could
17	Athese shoes that day.
18	Q. With that being the case, he could also have some
19	11's; isn't that correct?
20	A. I'm sure it's possible.
21	BY MR. CARTER: No further questions.
22	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:
23	Q. The shoes that you took off of his feet were size
24	ten and a half; is that correct?
25	A. Yes, sir.
26	BY MR. EVANS: Further nothing of this witness,
27	Your Honor.
28	BY THE COURT: Is he finally excused?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

	1/92
1	Bill Thornburg - DIRECT WITNESS EXCUSED.
2	BY THE COURT: All right. Who do you have next?
3	BY MR. EVANS: Sheriff Bill Thornburg.
4	BILL THORNBURG,
5	a white male called to testify again as a witness by the
6	State of Mississippi, this time in REBUTTAL, having been
7	previously sworn, testified as follows, to-wit:
8	BY THE COURT: State your name, please.
9	BY THE WITNESS: Bill Thornburg.
10	BY MR. EVANS: May I proceed, Your Honor?
11	BY THE COURT: Yes.
12	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:
13	Q. Sheriff, you are the same Sheriff Bill Thornburg
14	that has testified earlier in this case; is that correct?
15	A. Yes, sir.
16	Q. Sheriff, when you recovered Exhibit 79A well,
17	first, before you recovered it, when you first saw Exhibit
18	79A, where was it?
19	A. It was in the back bedroom of the apartments in a
20	chest of drawer that had nothing in it but the shoe box.
21	Q. Was anything in the shoe box?
22	A. It was not.
23	Q. So nothing was being stored in this box when you
24	first found it?
25	A. No, sir.
26	Q. Sheriff, during your investigation, did you have an
27	occasion to see and observe at different times the vehicle
28	that was owned by Doyle Simpson?
29	A. Yes, sir. I did.

Bill Thornburg - DIRECT

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

29

- Q. What is the color of that car?
- A. It's a kind of a copper brown, solid color.
- Q. Is it -- solid color. It does not have any stripes, dark or light on it, does it?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Now Sheriff, if somebody testified it had a dark stripe down the side of it, would that be correct?
 - A. No, sir.

BY MR. CARTER: I object, Your Honor. That is an improper question.

BY THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. Now the photograph 99A, I will ask you to look at this photograph right here. Can you explain to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury why this bottom part of that photograph looks dark?
 - A. Could I?
 - Q. Yes, sir. You may step down.
- A. (Witness steps down in front of large photograph on board.) The reason it's looking dark there, it is kind of in a shadow.
 - Q. Okay. But the car is solid color; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. You may have a seat.
- A. (Witness resumes witness stand.)
- 26 BY MR. EVANS: Tender the witness, Your Honor.
- 27 BY MR. CARTER: Yes, sir.

28 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CARTER:

Q. Sheriff Thornburg.

Bill Thornburg - CROSS

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So you are telling me the good Lord cast a shadow nowhere but down to the side of this car? It's nowhere else in this picture. The good Lord, the Almighty cast a shadow right across here and nowhere else on the car?
- A. I don't know whether the good Lord cast it or not, but it's a shadow.
- Q. Don't we see -- isn't it a fact that we see one color here?
 - A. I see it. Yes, sir.
- Q. And does it appear that there is a darker color underneath here?
 - A. It's just a shadow. Yes, sir.
- Q. So the shadow is from the rear right here; is that correct?
 - A. (No immediate response.)
 - Q. Apparently the shadow is here?
 - A. Yes, sir. It's from the rear all the way up there.

 BY MR. CARTER: One moment, Your Honor.

(Defense Counsel confer.)

BY THE BAILIFF: Judge Morgan, the jury wants to know if that picture can be brought around because they can't see it. There is a glare on it, and they can't see--

BY THE COURT: -- I can't hear you. What?

BY THE BAILIFF: The jury wants to know if that picture can be brought around. There is a glare, and they can't see what they are talking about on that picture.

Bill Thornburg - CROSS

(Picture on easel was turned a different way.)

BY THE COURT: Can you see it now?

(Jurors nod their heads.)

BY THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. CARTER:

- Q. Now Sheriff Thornburg, one of the wonderful things about being a police officer and investigating a case is that you want to make a record of what you find. That's why you take photographs; isn't that correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And as time passes, don't you agree that memories will fade?
 - A. A lot of times they will; yes, sir.
- Q. So isn't it a good idea to also make a written statement to put in writing what you saw at a particular time in order to avoid relying on memory. Wouldn't you agree with that?
 - A. Possibility.
- Q. Now did you make any writing, any record of what was in that box in Connie's house when you saw it?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. And don't you agree that a record, a written record would be more reliable than your eight year memory? A written record that was made on the day that you went there would be more reliable and more trustworthy than your eight year memory?
- A. Well, I distinctly remember that there was nothing in the box, and there was nothing in the drawer with the box.
 - Q. Okay, you haven't told us that. Did you tell us

1796 Bill Thornburg - CROSS - REDIRECT that before? 1 Α. I did. 2 When? You told me that before? 3 0. I did when I was up here before. Α. 4 Maybe you did. I don't remember. When you got the 5 Q. box, obtained the box, you didn't actually go back there and 6 7 get that box, did you? Connie went back there and got it. Α. 8 9 Ο. So you don't know what was in that box when she 10 went back there and got it, do you? 11 Α. There wasn't anything in it when she brought it up there, and there was nothing in it when I first seen it 12 13 earlier. 14 Okay, I can accept that. But when she went back Ο. 15 and got it by herself and you wasn't with her, you don't know what was in that box, do you? 16 17 Α. It wasn't anything in it when I seen it. 18 Do you understand my question? Do I need to ask Q. 19 you again? 20 Α. I do. I understand. 21 BY MR. CARTER: One moment. 22 (Defense Counsel confer.) 23 BY MR. CARTER: We tender, Your Honor. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS: 24 25 Q. All right, Sheriff, if you would, step down, 26 please. I will move this around in front of the jury. 27 Α. (Witness steps down in front of the jury box.)

Would you point out -- you have been asked if the only place

Now you can come on around this way, Sheriff.

28

29

Q.

Roy Harris - REDIRECT in that picture with shadows. What is this under the car? 1 That's a shadow. 2 Dark shadow; right? 3 Ο. Yes, sir. Α. 4 There is also a glare on part of that car; is that 5 Q. 6 correct? 7 It is. Α. But the car itself, is it a solid color? Q. 8 It is. 9 Α. And Sheriff, is your memory just as good today as 10 Q. 11 it was then as far as what was in that box? Yes, sir. 12 Α. How many days before the box was actually given to 13 you did you find that shoe box in the chest of drawers at 14 Connie Moore's house? 15 It was probably a week, two weeks. 16 Α. 17 Was anything in that box? Q. There was not. 18 Α. 19 BY MR. EVANS: That's all. Your Honor, we--20 BY THE COURT: You are through with him? 21 BY MR. EVANS: Through with the witness. 22 BY MR. CARTER: Your Honor--23 BY THE COURT: -- Is he finally excused? 24 BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. 25 BY MR. CARTER: No, Your Honor. We want to call 26 him on our rebuttal. 27 BY THE COURT: Stick around, Sheriff.

WITNESS LEAVES THE COURTROOM.

28

29

BY MR. EVANS: The State finally rests, Your

	Devel Conference
1	Bench Conference Honor.
2	STATE OF MISSISSIPPI RESTS ON REBUTTAL.
3	BY MR. CARTER: One minute. Can you give us a
4	minute, Your Honor? (Pause) Your Honor, may we
5	approach for a second?
6	(Ms. Ferraro enters the courtroom with an
7	envelope.)
8	BY MR. CARTER: Your Honor, give me one this
9	will answer the question of whether I need to talk to
10	anybody or not. (Mr. Carter gets out some
11	photographs.) We call Mr. Thornburg.
12	BY THE COURT: Well, you need to see me up here
13	first.
14	(CONFERENCE AT THE BENCH OUT OF THE HEARING OF THE
15	JURY AS FOLLOWS:)
16	BY THE COURT: There is normally no surrebuttal
17	in a case, and the only way it would be is if there is
18	new things brought up on rebuttal for you to
19	counteract. And he has just been on the stand subject
20	to cross-examination.
21	BY MR. CARTER: Well, Your Honor, we found some
22	new evidence to show that this car
23	BY THE COURT: When did you find it?
24	BY MR. DE GRUY: The issue just came up when he
25	put him on the stand.
26	BY THE COURT: Sure. He has been on the stand.
27	You could have cross-examined him then.
28	BY MR. CARTER: I did
29	BY THE COURT: When did you get this picture?

Bench Conference

BY MR. DE GRUY: They provided it in discovery.

BY THE COURT: Well, okay. So how long have you had it?

BY MR. DE GRUY: This issue of the stripe did not come up. He didn't testify that this was a shadow.

BY MR. CARTER: Until today.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Just now.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, the issue of the stripe came up in Tupelo. It's in the record in Tupelo--

BY MR. CARTER: --We didn't have anything to do with Tupelo.

BY MR. EVANS: As a matter of fact--

BY THE COURT: --Well, you did have something to do with examining your discovery. You did have something to do with cross-examining the man on rebuttal. You did have something to do with doing it when you are supposed to do it, and this is not new evidence. This is things that have-- this testimony was only on rebuttal to the testimony of the lady that said she saw the vehicle and a description of the picture. The picture has been in evidence. The jury can interpret it, both of those things, and it's just not new evidence.

BY MR. CARTER: Your Honor, just for the record, and it may be just my personal opinion, but I want to put it in the record. Mr. Thornburg, we believe, made a statement that is obviously false. We have proof to show that as far as, that we found the proof perhaps a

Bench Conference
couple of minutes after Mr. Thornburg left the witness
stand. I asked, I informed the Court that we wanted
to call Mr. Thornburg on surrebuttal so that I could
actually find the photograph. I realize that
procedurally--

BY MR. DE GRUY: We clearly did not release him.

BY MR. CARTER: I may be barred but in the interest of justice and fairness, I think it would be incumbent on the Court to let me call him back to show him this photograph.

(Photograph was shown to the Court.)

BY THE COURT: Is that the same vehicle?

(Mr. Evans looks at the photograph.)

BY MR. EVANS: It could be. I can't say for sure.

BY THE COURT: Well, before I allow this, y'all need to go discuss the, both sides go discuss with Mr. Thornburg whether he can identify that picture. If he can't identify it, then there is nothing he can testify to.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, for the record, this same witness in Tupelo, which I know that is not before the Court, but they are aware of the transcripts. This same witness in Tupelo saw the glare--

BY THE COURT: I agree, Mr. Evans. But in order to be rather safe than sorry, if he can identify that picture, I will let him testify only to that particular issue about that, but I don't even know

	Bench Conference
1	whether he can do that at this time. Do you want to
2	go with them?
3	BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.
4	BY THE COURT: Okay.
5	END BENCH CONFERENCE.
6	(ALL COUNSEL AND THE DEFENDANT LEAVE THE COURTROOM.
7	UPON THEIR RETURN TO THE COURTROOM, THERE WAS THE FOLLOWING
8	FURTHER BENCH CONFERENCE OUT OF THE HEARING OF THE JURY:)
9	BY MR. EVANS: They want to make a record of the
10	fact that the Sheriff says he can't say for sure if
11	that's the same car or not.
12	BY THE COURT: Okay, well, if he can't, then the
13	picture is not relevant at all because we don't even
14	know whose car it is. It has never been identified by
15	anybody. Okay, make whatever record you would like.
16	BY MR. DE GRUY: I had to step closer so you can
17	hear me.
18	BY THE COURT: Let the record reflect the Sheriff
19	is standing before the bench.
20	BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, do you want me to
21	mark this for identification?
22	BY THE COURT: Yeah.
23	(PHOTOGRAPH OF A CAR WAS MARKED AS DEFENDANT'S
24	EXHIBIT D-5 FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
25	EXAMINATION OF BILL THORNBURG BY MR. DE GRUY: (AT THE BENCH)
26	Q. I'm showing you a Polaroid of a car that has been
27	marked as D-5 for identification. Is that the same car you
28	testified to, Doyle Simpson's car?

A. There is a lot of shadow on it. It's a car that

Bench Conference looks like his.

looks like his. Whether it's the same color or not, I -- there is so much shadow on it you can't tell.

picture has just now been produced. It has not been identified by anybody as to whose car it is, what it is. The Sheriff cannot identify it as Doyle Simpson's vehicle. Therefore it's not relevant. It might, it might have been arguable under cross-examination or anything like that, but as to surrebuttal, it is not admissible. And the Court rules that there will be no surrebuttal of this witness.

BY MR. DE GRUY: And Your Honor, for the record, this picture was provided to us by the District Attorney's Office in discovery.

BY THE COURT: Right. And they have had discovery for months now and didn't cross-examine him on it when they had the opportunity. The Court finds also that this issue has -- the jury has sufficient information to be able to determine this issue one way or another.

END BENCH CONFERENCE.

BY MR. CARTER: We are done.

BOTH SIDES FINALLY REST.

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you have now heard all the testimony in this case. I must meet with the lawyers and prepare the instruction on the law that I'm going to give you. I will do that and then bring you back. I will read those instructions to you, and then the lawyers will arque this case to

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT Then I will turn all of this over to you for 1 your decision. You may go to the jury room. 2 JURY LEAVES THE COURTROOM. 3 BY THE COURT: Mr. Hill, do you have your new 4 instructions? 5 BY MR. HILL: Yes, sir. I have provided Defense 6 a copy of that. I think that's the main one that had 7 to be redone at this point. 8 9 BY MR. DE GRUY: There are a couple of other instructions. 10 (Mr. Hill and Mr. de Gruy both handed documents to 11 12 the Court.) 13 INSTRUCTION NO. S-1: BY THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Okay, have you looked at this new instruction, new S-1? 14 BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor. And at this 15 time for the record, a question we had left open yesterday 16 17 was the circumstantial evidence instruction, and I have researched that last night, and we are going to withdraw our 18 19 circumstantial evidence instructions without waiving our 20 argument on the unreliability of and inadmissibility of the testimony that took it out of the circumstantial evidence 21 case. I concede that the law does cover that, and it 22 23 wouldn't be proper. 24 BY THE COURT: Okay. The Court does find 25 specifically too first in Moore v. State, 787 So.2d 1282 and 26 Ladner v. State, 584 So.2d 743 that this is a direct evidence case. Okay, let's see. Do you object -- other than that part 27 28 of it, do you object to anything in the form of it, of S-1?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, we have submitted a,

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT as we discussed yesterday, that we were asking for a murder 1 2 instruction. Simple murder, right? BY THE COURT: 3 Simple murder. And we have BY MR. DE GRUY: 4 submitted as D-16A through D in one instruction the capital 5 murder charge and the murder charge. And it's our position 6 7 that presenting it that way and with, in four separate instructions is the easiest for the jury to follow and 8 understand the instruction. The State's instruction is, in 9 our position, confusing or could confuse and particularly 10 11 with the murder instruction, that they should be together. 12 BY THE COURT: Mr. Hill, I believe you told me 13 you had a simple murder instruction? BY MR. HILL: I do, Your Honor. I didn't know if 14 15 I should proffer that to the Court, if the Court had made that decision. 16 17 BY THE COURT: Well, I have not made that 18 I will hear the argument on it. decision. 19 BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, would it be okay if y'all go ahead through the rest of these instructions and 20 21 give me just a few minutes while y'all are doing that before 22 we argue on that particular instruction? 23 BY THE COURT: Okay, I have got the Fairchild 24 case here if you want to look at it. 25 Yes, sir. BY MR. EVANS: 26 BY THE COURT: I think it is clear as to what it

29 **BY MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Judge.

says in relation to this case.

(Case handed to Mr. Evans.)

27

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT I'm just going to wait until you BY THE COURT: 1 2 do that. BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. 3 (Mr. Hills hands more instructions to the Court. 4 Mr. Evans left the courtroom with the victims' families, and 5 upon his return, proceedings continued as follows:) 6 BY THE COURT: Mr. Evans now having read the 7 Fairchild case, do you have any objection in this particular 8 case to a lesser included instruction? 9 BY MR. EVANS: No, sir. 10 11 BY THE COURT: Okay. I am going to grant S-1 as tendered by the State which is the capital murder 12 13 instruction. I note there is no objection as to the form of that instruction from the Defense. Is that correct? Other 14 15 than the fact that you would rather have yours? BY MR. DE GRUY: That our form, to the extent 16 17 that we believe our form is the one that should be submitted. BY THE COURT: Okay. I do not agree with that. 18 19 I think it more properly should be submitted in the form that 20 I'm going to give it. And by that, I mean there were several instructions to be read in a row and in sequence which will, 21 22 I think, better inform the jury as to what their options are. 23 So S-1 is granted as Instruction number 6. 24 INSTRUCTION NO. S-2: BY THE COURT: 25 BY MR. HILL: -- You may want to look at S-2. I'm not sure I have resubmitted the proper--26 27 BY THE COURT: Oh, that's right; you did.

29 BY MR. HILL: I believe that's the correct

28

sorry.

	Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT
1	version of it.
2	BY THE COURT: S-2 instructs the jury on the
3	elements of armed robbery. Is there any objection to that?
4	BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor.
5	BY THE COURT: That is given as Instruction
6	number 7.
7	INSTRUCTION NO. S-6: BY THE COURT: S-6 is the
8	first part of the lesser included instruction which tells the
9	jury that they can find the lesser included offense. Any
10	objection to the form there?
11	BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor.
12	BY THE COURT: That is given as Instruction
13	number 8.
14	INSTRUCTION NO. S-7: BY THE COURT: This next one
15	is the lesser included instruction. You have got it entitled
16	as S-1. I'm going to make that S let's don't make it S-1.
17	It's not S-1. It's just, let's say it's S-7. Okay?
18	BY MR. HILL: That's fine, Your Honor. I just
19	failed to make that change on the number.
20	BY THE COURT: All right. This has four
21	different well, it covers all four counts and instructs
22	them on the elements of simple murder. As to the form, do
23	you have any objection to that?
24	BY MR. DE GRUY: No objection to the form.
25	BY THE COURT: And that is given as Instruction
26	number 9.
27	INSTRUCTION NO. S-3: BY THE COURT: S-3 is an
28	instruction concerning robbery. Any objection to it? I

think yesterday y'all said that you had no objection to S-3.

	Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT
1	BY MR. DE GRUY: This is the in the presence?
2	BY THE COURT: A thing in the presence of.
3	BY MR. DE GRUY: No objection.
4	BY THE COURT: Okay. That is Instruction number
5	10.
6	INSTRUCTION NO. S-4: BY THE COURT: S-4 is the one
7	that directs them that this is only a guilt phase of the
8	trial. Any objection to that?
9	BY MR. DE GRUY: No objection.
10	BY THE COURT: That is Number 11.
11	INSTRUCTION NO. S-5: BY THE COURT: S-5 is
12	deliberate design, defines deliberate design. I believe
13	yesterday you had no objection?
14	BY MR. DE GRUY: That's correct.
15	BY THE COURT: Is that still correct?
16	BY MR. DE GRUY: That's correct.
17	FORM OF THE VERDICT INSTRUCTION: BY THE COURT:
18	Okay. This next one I have is a form of the verdict form,
19	and that is not going to be accurate.
20	BY MR. EVANS: Right.
21	BY THE COURT: We are going to have to redo that
22	that would include that.
23	(To the Court Reporter) We also need our form that we use.
24	Have you got it in the computer? The one where you
25	check.
26	BY THE COURT REPORTER: It will have to be
27	changed.
28	BY THE COURT: Okay. All right, we will need

that. All right, I will withhold that on the form of

	Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT
1	the verdict until we prepare a new one.
2	INSTRUCTION NO. D-14: BY THE COURT: Okay, as to
3	D-14, have you got any authority for that instruction?
4	BY MR. DE GRUY: Ferrill v. State, 643 So.2d 501.
5	BY THE COURT: Did it have that instruction in
6	it?
7	BY MR. DE GRUY: I don't have the case with me.
8	I can tell you that it's a clear statement of the law, and I
9	think it says that instruction, an instruction should be
10	given when
11	BY THE COURT: I need to see that case then.
12	BY MR. DE GRUY: Do we have a law library back
13	here?
14	BY THE COURT: Uh-hum. How complete it is is
15	another story now. Okay, I withhold my ruling on
16	D-14.
17	INSTRUCTION NO. D-15: BY THE COURT: Okay, D-15.
18	I mean D-15A B, C, and D are all instructions of lesser
19	included offense of murder. I have already given those
20	instructions. Therefore, I refuse these as being
21	repetitious.
22	INSTRUCTION NO. D-2A: BY THE COURT: Okay, is D-2A
23	is a form of the verdict. I'm going to have one of those.
24	The Court will enter its own instruction as to the form, so
25	it's refused.
26	INSTRUCTIONS D-1A, D-1B, D-1C AND D-1D: BY MR. DE
27	GRUY: The next one is a correction of the count number.
28	BY THE COURT: I am trying to find all my stuff.

I have kind of got it scattered. D-1A, D-1B, D-1C and D-1D

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT are requests for peremptory instructions on the four 1 different counts. They are refused. 2 (Ms. Ferraro returns to the courtroom with case 3 law.) 4 INSTRUCTION NO. D-16A, D-16B, D-16C AND D-16D: 5 THE COURT: Okay D-16A, D-16B, D-16C, and D-16D are 6 instructions, essentially the same instruction as S-1, and I 7 refuse them as being repetitious. 8 CONTINUATION ON INSTRUCTION D-14: BY MR. DE GRUY: 9 Your Honor, this is Ferrill v. State, 643 So.2d 501, a 1994. 10 On page 504 is the jury instruction. 11 BY THE COURT: All right. 12 (Pause while the Court reads.) 13 BY THE COURT: Are y'all familiar with this case, 14 15 Ferrill v. State? BY MR. EVANS: No, sir, but as far as this 16 17 particular instruction, the State would argue against it for several reasons. One, it's telling the jury how to--18 19 BY THE COURT: -- This instruction they have 20 submitted is not proper. But it would look like under 21 Ferrill, they are entitled to an impeachment instruction. And I will grant you one consistent with the instructions in 22 23 Ferrill if y'all want to redraw one. 24 BY MR. DE GRUY: Okay. Do you want a verbatim--25 BY THE COURT: I think it needs to be -- the

BY THE COURT: I think it needs to be -- the Court has approved -- there are two instructions that are substantially the same contained in the Ferrill case, and they have approved both of those instructions. So those are the instructions that I will give, or one of those, and I

26

27

28

1810 Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT don't think there is a dime's worth of difference between 1 them. And so I will give one of them. I tell you what; if 2 you will do this, Mr. de Gruy; if you will come up here and 3 pick out which one of these you want, I will get the Court 4 Reporter to type them for us. 5 (Mr. de Gruy approaches the bench.) 6 BY THE COURT: That is the one in this case, and 7 that was the one in the former case, and I don't think there 8 is hardly any, there is very little difference. Have you 9 seen this instruction? 10 No, sir. 11 BY MR. EVANS: BY THE COURT: You need to look at it too. 12 (Mr. Evans approaches the bench.) 13 BY MR. EVANS: I have seen that one, Your Honor. 14 15 (Pause while everyone reads.) BY THE COURT: Do you have any objection to the 16 form of it? 17 18 BY MR. EVANS: No, sir. 19 (FOLLOWING A RECESS FOR THE COURT REPORTER TO GO TYPE THE INSTRUCTION REFERRED TO ABOVE AND THE FORM OF THE 20 VERDICT INSTRUCTION, OBJECTIONS TO INSTRUCTIONS CONTINUED IN 21 OPEN COURT WITH ALL COUNSEL AND THE DEFENDANT PRESENT BUT 22 WITH THE JURY STILL OUT:) 23 24 INSTRUCTION NO. D-17: BY THE COURT: Has everybody 25 looked at the impeachment instruction up here? 26 BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, sir. BY THE COURT: Mr. Evans? 27

29 Honor. But as long as it's the one that was in the book, I

BY MR. EVANS: I don't believe I have, Your

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT don't object to it. 1 BY THE COURT: I don't have the case in front of 2 me. I'm assuming it is. Linda typed it out of the book. 3 BY MR. EVANS: It's fine. 4 BY THE COURT: I don't know what "D" number it 5 is, but just so we have some designation, I'm going to make 6 the impeachment instruction D-20. That would be far enough 7 over, wouldn't it? 8 BY MR. DE GRUY: Yeah, that will be -- I believe 9 number 17. It would be D-17. 10 BY THE COURT: 17, okay. It is given, and it's 11 12 given as Instruction number 13. INSTRUCTION NO. C-6: BY THE COURT: The next one, 13 the form of the verdict will be C-6 and Instruction number 14 15 14. Y'all have looked at that and approved it; is that 16 correct? 17 BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor. As to form. We had submitted our own. 18 19 BY THE COURT: Right. BY MR. DE GRUY: And with both of these 20 21 instructions, we stand by the ones we submitted, but we have 22 no objection to the form of these instructions based on the 23 Court's rulings. 24 BY THE COURT: Okay. Did they show you the 25 verdict form that we use? 26 BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes.

INSTRUCTION NO. D-3: BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, I think we had discussions yesterday about D-3 which was the

BY THE COURT: All right.

27

28

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT foreperson instruction. 1 BY THE COURT: I generally, I am going to give a 2 foreperson instruction if, in fact, there should be a 3 sentencing phase. I don't think the law requires it at the 4 guilt phase. I have never given it at the guilt phase. 5 INSTRUCTION NO. D-5: BY MR. DE GRUY: And just so 6 the record is clear. I think you also denied D-5 yesterday. 7 Is that--8 BY THE COURT: What was that? 9 BY MR. DE GRUY: It's a Sandstrom instruction, 10 the essential, proving every essential fact. 11 BY THE COURT: Let me look at it and see. 12 (Pause while the Court reviews several instructions 13 and then goes back over Defense Instructions as follows:) 14 BY THE COURT: Okay, there is a D-2 that y'all 15 had filed and a D-2A. I refused D-2A. Did y'all withdraw 16 D-2? 17 BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, I believe D-2 was the form 18 of the verdict that didn't include the murder instruction, so 19 we withdrew D-2, and then you denied the form of the verdict 20 that we submitted. 21 BY THE COURT: Okay. D-3 is that foreman 22 instruction which I will give if this case goes further than 23 this. It's refused at this point. D-4 was refused or 24 25 withdrawn because the Court had already given that instruction. 26 27 BY MR. DE GRUY: That's correct.

BY THE COURT: Withdrawn?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, sir. D-4 is withdrawn.

28

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF INSTRUCTION D-5: BY THE 1 I refuse D-5 on the basis that it was covered by the 2 Court's instructions. 3 INSTRUCTIONS D-6 AND D-7: BY THE COURT: D-6 is a 4 circumstantial instruction. 5 BY MR. DE GRUY: D-6 and 7 were withdrawn. 6 INSTRUCTION NO. D-8: BY THE COURT: Okay. D-8, 7 the Court -- D-8 is covered by the Court's first instruction. 8 And it may add some things, but the Court's first instruction 9 adequately advises the jury as to what they are to consider 10 11 in weighing the evidence. Therefore, I refuse it. INSTRUCTION NO. D-9: BY THE COURT: D-9, 12 13 withdrawn? I have given it. BY MR. DE GRUY: I had marked that it was denied 14 yesterday but --15 BY THE COURT: Well, you don't have to withdraw 16 I have given it in C-1. You can withdraw it, or I will 17 deny it, one or the other, whatever you want. 18 BY MR. DE GRUY: You can deny it. 19 20 BY THE COURT: Okay. INSTRUCTION NO. D-10: BY THE COURT: I have given 21 22 an identification instruction. When you couple it with the 23 instructions I have given in C-1 as to how they are to 24 consider the evidence and the credibility of witnesses and things and other instructions, taking the instructions as a 25 whole, D-10 has already been covered by the other Court's 26 27 instructions, and I refuse it. 28 INSTRUCTION NO. D-11: BY THE COURT: What do you

29 say to D-11?

Instructions read to jury 1 2 3 4 5 covered by C-1. INSTRUCTION NO. D-13: 6 7 hung jury instruction. I refuse it. 8 9 10 covers it. 11 JURY ENTERS THE COURTROOM. 12 13 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY MR. HILL: We looked at that yesterday. That is covered by the Court's Instruction C-1.

BY THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to refuse it.

INSTRUCTION NO. D-12: BY THE COURT: Also, D-12 is

BY THE COURT: D-13 is a

BY THE COURT: Okay. Are there any defense instructions now that I have not ruled on?

BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor. I think that

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, at the outset of this trial, I told you that at the end of the trial I would read to you my instructions on the law, and I'm going to do that right now. These instructions, as you see, are in writing. You will have them to take with you to the jury room for your deliberations after I have read these and the lawyers will argue this case.

"You have heard all of the testimony and received the evidence and will hear the arguments of counsel shortly. I will now instruct you as to the rules of law which you will apply to this evidence in reaching your verdict.

When you took your place in the jury box, you took an oath that you would follow and apply these rules to the evidence in reaching your verdict in this case. It is, therefore, your duty as jurors to follow the law which I shall now state to you.

Instructions read to jury

You are not to be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law. Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of your sworn duty to base your verdict upon any other view of law than that given in these instructions.

You are not to single out one instruction alone as stating the law, but you must consider these instructions as a whole.

It is your exclusive province to determine the facts in this case and to consider and weigh the evidence for that purpose. The authority thus vested in you is not an arbitrary power, but most be exercised with sincere judgment, sound discretion and in accordance with the rules of law.

Both parties have a right to expect that you will conscientiously consider and weigh the evidence and apply the law of the case.

It is your duty to determine the facts and to determine them from the evidence produced in open court. You are to apply the law to the facts and in this way decide the case. You should not be influenced by bias, sympathy, or prejudice. Your verdict should be based on the evidence and not upon speculation, guesswork, or conjecture.

You are required and expected to use your good common sense and sound honest judgment in considering and weighing the testimony of each witness who has testified in this case.

The evidence which you are to consider consists of the testimony and statements of the witnesses and exhibits offered and received. You are also permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the evidence as seem justified in

Instructions read to jury light of your own experience.

Arguments, statements, and remarks of counsel are intended to help you understand the evidence and apply the law, but are not evidence. If any argument, statement, or remark has no basis in the evidence, then you should disregard that argument, statement, or remark.

The production of evidence in court is governed by rules of law. From time to time during the trial it has been my duty as judge to rule on the admissibility of evidence.

You must not concern yourselves with the reasons for my rulings since they are controlled and governed by the rules of law. You should not infer from my rulings on these motions or objections to the evidence that I have any opinion on the merits favoring one side or the other. You should not speculate as to possible answers to questions which I did not require to be answered. Further, you should not draw any inference from the content of these questions.

You are to disregard all evidence which I excluded from consideration during the course of the trial.

If in stating the law to you, I repeat any rule, direction, or idea; or if I state the same in varying ways, no emphasis is intended, and you must not draw any inference therefrom. The order in which these instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance.

The law presumes every person charged with the commission of a crime to be innocent. This presumption places upon the State the burden of proving the defendant guilty of every material element of the crime with which the defendant is charged. Before you can return a verdict of

Instructions read to jury guilty, the State must prove to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty. The presumption of innocence attends the defendant throughout the trial and prevails at its close unless overcome by evidence which satisfies the jury of the Defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant is not required to prove his or her innocence.

The verdict of the jury must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return a verdict, it will be necessary that each juror agree. In other words, all twelve jurors must agree before returning a verdict in this case. It is your sworn duty as jurors to consult with one other and to deliberate in view of reaching an agreement, if you can do so without violence to your individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is erroneous, but do not surrender your honest convictions as to the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the purpose of returning a verdict.

Members of the jury, shortly after you were selected, I informed you that you could take notes, and I instructed you as to the appropriate use of any notes that you might take. Most importantly, an individual juror's notes may be used by that juror only and may not be shown to or shared with other jurors. Notes are only a memory aid, and a juror's notes may be used only as an aid to refresh

Instructions read to jury
that particular juror's memory and assist that juror in
recalling the actual testimony. Each of you must rely on
your own independent recollection of the proceedings.
Whether you took notes or not, each of you must form and
express your own opinion as to the facts of this case. Be
aware that during the course of your deliberations there
might be the temptation to allow notes to cause certain
portions of the evidence to receive undue emphasis and
receive attention out of proportion to the entire evidence.
But a juror's memory or impression is entitled to no greater
weight just because he or she took notes, and you should not
be influenced by the notes of other jurors.

Thus, during your deliberations, do not assume simply because something appears in your notes that it necessarily took place in court.

The burden of proof in this case is on the State to prove the Defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant is not required to prove anything in this cause or to testify in his own behalf. You must not hold the facts that the Defendant did not testify in this case against him or as any evidence of guilt.

The Court instructs the jury that the law looks with suspicion and distrust on the testimony of an alleged informant and requires the jury to weigh the same with great care and suspicion. You should weigh the testimony from an alleged informant in passing on what weight, if any, you should give this testimony. You should weigh it with great care and caution and look upon it with distrust and suspicion.

Instructions read to jury

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

The Court instructs that in reaching your verdict, you are to consider all of the evidence concerning the entire case and the circumstances surrounding the crime. One of the issues in this case is the identification of Curtis Giovanni Flowers as the perpetrator of the crime. As with each element of the crime charged, the State has the burden of proving identity beyond a reasonable doubt. And before you may convict Curtis Giovanni Flowers, you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the accuracy of the identification of Curtis Giovanni Flowers. If after considering all of the evidence concerning the crime and witness identification of Curtis Giovanni Flowers as the person who committed the crime, you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that he is the person who committed the crime, then you must find him not guilty. Identification testimony is an expression of belief or impression by the witness. You must judge its value and reliability from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the crime and the subsequent identification. In appraising the identification testimony of a witness, you should consider the following:

Did the witness have an adequate opportunity to observe the offender?

Did the witness observe the offender with an adequate degree of attention?

Did the witness provide an accurate description of offender of the crime?

How certain is the witness of the identification?

How much time passed between the crime and the identification?

Instructions read to jury
If, after examining all of the testimony and the evidence,
you have a reasonable doubt that Curtis Giovanni Flowers was
the person who committed the crime, then you must find Curtis
Giovanni Flowers not guilty.

The Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, has been charged with four separate indictments, in four separate indictments with the crimes of the capital murders of Bertha Tardy, Robert Golden, Carmen Rigby, and Derrick Stewart.

These charges have been consolidated for trial in this case; therefore, all twelve of you must unanimously agree on and return a separate verdict for each of the four charges.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July the 16th, 1996, in Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully, feloniously, either with or without deliberate design, then and there kill and murder Bertha Tardy, a human being, without authority in law, when engaged in the commission of the crime of armed robbery, then if you so believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of the capital murder of Bertha Tardy, then it is your sworn duty to say so by your verdict.

If the State has failed to prove any one or more of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you shall find the Defendant not guilty of the capital murder of Bertha Tardy.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July 16, 1996, in

Instructions read to jury
Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully,
feloniously, either with or without deliberate design, then
and there kill and murder Robert Golden, a human being,
without authority of law, when engaged in the commission of
the crime of armed robbery, then if you believe from all the
evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the
Defendant is guilty of the capital murder of Robert Golden,
then it is your sworn duty to say so by your verdict.

If the State has failed to prove any one or more of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you shall find the Defendant not guilty of the capital murder of Robert Golden.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July 16, 1996, in Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, either with or without deliberate design, then and there kill and murder Carmen Rigby, a human being, without authority of law when engaged in the commission of the crime of armed robbery, then if you so believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of the capital murder of Carmen Rigby, then it is your sworn duty to say so by your verdict.

If the State has failed to prove any one of more or these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you shall find the Defendant not guilty of the capital murder of Carmen Rigby.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis

Instructions read to jury
Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July 16, 1996, in
Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully, and
feloniously, either with or without deliberate design, then
and there kill and murder Derrick Stewart, a human being,
without authority of law when engaged in the commission of
the crime of armed robbery, then if you so believe from all
the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the
Defendant is guilty of the capital murder of Derrick Stewart,
then it is your sworn duty to say so by your verdict.

If the State has failed to prove any one or more of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you shall find the Defendant not guilty of the capital murder of Derrick Stewart.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July the 16th, 1996, in Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully and feloniously, with the felonious intent to permanently deprive the owner thereof, take, steal and carry away or attempt to take, steal and carry away the personal property of Bertha Tardy, doing business as Tardy Furniture Store, from the presence and against the will of Bertha Tardy, by violence to her person with a deadly weapon, then the same would constitute armed robbery.

The Court instructs the jury that if warranted by the evidence, you may find the Defendant guilty of a crime lesser than capital murder on any one or more of the four charges. However, notwithstanding this right, it is your duty to accept the law as given to you by the Court, and if

Instructions read to jury the facts and law warrant a conviction for the crime of capital murder, then it is your duty to make such finding uninfluenced by your power to find a lesser offense. This provision is not designed to relieve you from the performance of an unpleasant duty. It is included to prevent a failure of justice if the evidence fails to prove the original charge of capital murder on any one or more of the four charges, but does justify a verdict for the lesser crime of murder.

If you find that the defendant has failed -- I meant "that the State has failed to prove any one or more of the essential elements of the crime of capital murder on any or all of the four charges of capital murder, you must find the Defendant not guilty of capital murder on that charge or charges as the case may be. You will then proceed with your deliberations to decide whether the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt all of the elements of the lesser crime of murder on that charge or charges as the case may be.

The crime of murder is distinguished from the crime of capital murder by the failure to prove that the murder or murders, as the case may be, were committed when the defendant was engaged in the crime of armed robbery.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July the 16th, 1996, in Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, with the deliberate design to effect death, then and there kill and murder Bertha Tardy, a human being, without authority of law, then if you so believe from all the

Instructions read to jury evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is guilty of the murder of Bertha Tardy, then it is your sworn duty to say so by your verdict.

If the State has failed to prove any one or more of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you shall find the defendant not guilty of the murder of Bertha Tardy.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July 16, 1996, in Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, with deliberate design to effect death, then and there kill and murder Robert Golden, a human being, without authority of law, then if you so believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the murder of Robert Golden, then it is your sworn duty to say so by your verdict.

If the State has failed to prove any one or more of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you shall find the defendant not guilty of the murder of Robert Golden.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July 16, 1996, in Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, with deliberate design to effect death, then and there kill and murder Carmen Rigby, a human being, without authority of law, then if you so believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the murder of Carmen Rigby, then it is your sworn duty to say so by your verdict.

Instructions read to jury

If the State has failed to prove any one or more of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you shall find the Defendant not guilty of the murder of Carmen Rigby.

If you believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, did on or about July the 16th, 1996, in Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, with deliberate design to effect death, then and there kill and murder Derrick Stewart, a human being, without authority of law, then if you so believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the murder of Derrick Stewart, then it is your sworn duty to say so by your verdict.

If the State has failed to prove any one or more of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you shall find the defendant not guilty of the murder of Derrick Stewart.

A thing is in the presence of a person, in respect to robbery, which is so within her reach, inspection, observation, or control that he could, if not overcome with violence or prevented by fear, retain his possession of it.

This phase of the trial deals only with the question of the guilt or innocence of the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers. In the event that you find the defendant guilty of capital murder, then you will then and only then, after being further instructed by the Court in the second phase of this trial, consider the appropriate sentence to be imposed.

The Court further instructs the jury that deliberate design as used elsewhere in these instructions,

Instructions read to jury means intent to kill, without authority of law and not being justifiable or legally excusable.

A deliberate design cannot be formed at the very moment of the fatal act; however, the deliberate design need not exist in the mind of the defendant for any definite time, not for hours, days, or even minutes, but if there is deliberate design, and it exists in the mind of the defendant but for an instant before the fatal act, this is sufficient deliberate design to constitute the offense of capital murder.

The testimony of a witness or witnesses may be discredited or impeached by showing that on a prior occasion they have made a statement which is consistent with or contradictory to their testimony in this case. In order to have this effect, the inconsistent or contradictory prior statement must involve a matter which is material to the issues in this case.

The prior statement of the witness or witnesses can be considered by you only for the purpose of determining the weight or believability that you give to the testimony of the witnesses or witnesses that made them. You may not consider the prior statement as proving the guilt or innocence of the defendant.

Your verdict must be plainly marked on the separate form provided by the Court. It need not be signed by you and may be in either of the following forms. If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, guilty of the capital murder of Bertha Tardy, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the defendant guilty of the capital

Instructions read to jury murder of Bertha Tardy.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, guilty of the lesser included offense of murder of Bertha Tardy, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the lesser included offense of murder of Bertha Tardy.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, not guilty of the capital murder or the lesser included offense of murder of Bertha Tardy, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant not guilty of either the capital murder or the lesser included offense of murder of Bertha Tardy.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, guilty of the capital murder of Robert Golden, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the capital murder of Robert Golden.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, guilty of the lesser included offense of murder of Robert Golden, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the lesser included offense of murder of Robert Golden.

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, not guilty of the capital murder or the lesser included offense of murder of Robert Golden, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant not guilty of either the capital murder or the lesser included offense of murder of Robert Golden.

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, guilty of the capital murder of Carmen Rigby, then the form

Instructions read to jury of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant quilty of the capital murder of Carmen Rigby.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, guilty of the lesser included offense of murder of Carmen Rigby, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the lesser included offense of murder of Carmen Rigby.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, not guilty of the capital murder or the lesser included offense of murder of Carmen Rigby, the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant not guilty of either the capital murder or the lesser included offense of murder of Carmen Rigby.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, guilty of the capital murder of Derrick Stewart, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the capital murder of Derrick Stewart.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, guilty of the lesser included offense of murder of Derrick Stewart, then the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the lesser included offense of murder of Derrick Stewart.'

If you find the Defendant, Curtis Giovanni Flowers, not guilty of either the capital murder or the lesser included offense of murder of Derrick Stewart, the form of your verdict shall be: 'We, the jury, find the Defendant not guilty of either the capital murder or the lesser included offense of murder of Derrick Stewart.'"

All of those verdicts are on this verdict form.

When you have unanimously reached a verdict on each of those counts, then you should check that verdict. At that time then you should knock on the door. The bailiffs will tell me that you have reached a verdict, and I will bring you back into Court to deliver that verdict. Mr. Evans.

BY MR. EVANS: Thank you, Your Honor.

FINAL ARGUMENT BY MR. EVANS:

Ladies and gentlemen, several days ago we started this trial. We did the opening statements. In those opening statements I laid out for you a road map of what we expect to prove in this trial in hopes that you would follow it as we went through the trial. I'm going to briefly go back through what we have proven to you and show you that we did, in fact, prove to you the elements that we told you we would.

To start with, back in July, July 16, 1996, everything was operating normal in Winona. Tardy Furniture store was open that morning. Bertha Tardy, the owner, was at work. Carmen Rigby, the bookkeeper, was there. Two other young men were there, Robert Golden and Derrick Stewart. They were there waiting on Sam Jones to come show them how to load some furniture because neither one of them had even been there long enough yet to know how they needed to load and haul the furniture. So we have got four people that are minding their own business at work, trying to make a living, and someone comes in and kills them and takes the store's money. And that's what we are here about today.

Now before I go into all the details, the Court has told you you have got two options in this case as far as

Final Argument by Mr. Evans
guilty. The first is capital murder. The second is just
plain murder. It's distinguished by one element, and that is
the robbery. If you find that no money was taken from the
store, then that could be regular murder. But we have proven
clearly to you through Roxanne Ballard that money was, in
fact, taken.

Y'all saw the picture of the cash drawer. You heard the testimony of Roxanne that there was always money in that drawer. The drawer was always put in the safe and locked up at night. That drawer was pulled out in the morning. Normally it had \$300.00 in it. This particular morning it had \$400.00 in it, and she explained to you how she knew that, because of the receipts that were in there. So there was money taken, and it was a robbery.

Now for a robbery, as the Judge has told you in the instructions, what we must prove is that personal property of hers or the store's was taken by violence to her body. It can't be much more violent than being shot in the head.

Y'all have seen the pictures. You have heard Sam Jones testify how when he went up there that morning to show these two boys how to load the furniture, he walks in and found this horrible scene. Derrick Stewart was still alive. He was gurgling in his blood. He was trying to survive. The other three were already dead, no doubt about it. Everybody in the store had been shot in the head with a .380 automatic. Robert Golden had been shot twice in the head.

You heard the testimony from Dr. Hayne. One of the elements we must prove is how they were killed. There can be no argument how they were killed. All four of these people

Final Argument by Mr. Evans were killed by being shot in the head with a .380 automatic pistol.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

I told you on opening statements that we would prove to you where that pistol came from, and we did. proved to you that that pistol came out of Doyle Simpson's, the Defendant's uncle's car. And we proved that to 100 percent certainty because you have heard the testimony of the expert. He compared the bullets that came out of the store. He compared the bullets that came out of the post where Doyle had test fired that gun. And we would have never known about the bullets in that post if it hadn't been for Doyle taking the officers out there to the post. He cooperated and took them out there. He showed them where he had fired the gun. They dug the bullets out of the post, and they took those bullets along with the bullets out of the crime scene, the bullets that went through these four victims' heads. Some of them were still in their heads when the autopsies were done. They were removed by Dr. Hayne. The expert David Balash testified that he compared those bullets at the scene to the bullets that were known to be fired from Doyle's gun, and he told you to 100 percent certainty they were fired from the same gun. So we have proved to you what gun was used.

Now how does that tie to the Defendant? To start with, we know from the testimony that that gun was in his car that morning, locked in the glove compartment. We know that his nephew knew that gun was in there, and now we know that he was leaning against that car that morning about 7:15, the car that the gun was stolen out of.

Final Argument by Mr. Evans

Now I want you to remember as I'm going through these things, that in the statement he gave Jack Matthews, he said he was never on the east side of Highway 51, nowhere on the east side of Highway 51 that entire morning. Angelica is on the east side of Highway 51. Where that car was is on the east side of Highway 51. He is leaning against the car at about 7:15 that the gun comes out of. What did she say? She didn't say, I think that was him. She didn't say, I have never seen this person before, but I believe it looked like him. She said she knew him. She knew who he was that day.

What else did she say? She really didn't want to get involved is why she didn't give his name that first day because she was scared. But she told y'all that she knew it was him just like she told the officers, just like she pointed him out of the lineup. And when they showed her that lineup, she didn't even have to walk over to the lineup before she even went across the room. She pointed to him and said, That is him right there. That is the person I have known; that is the person that was at the car. I know him. That's him.

We go on down. Lee Edward McChristian on Academy Street; he sees him walk by his house a little bit later. You know, all of these places are on the east side of Highway 51, and remember, he says he wasn't there. All these folks are just lying on him.

I submit to you that because of good police work, we can pinpoint his exact path from leaving his house, go to Angelica, back to his house, and then back to town to Tardy Furniture. I'm going to lay that out for you in a few

Final Argument by Mr. Evans minutes, but you have seen it already. You have heard these witnesses like Beneva Henry that have no reason to come in here and lie on him; has known him all of her life; says yes, I saw him walk by my house. He was headed toward town in the same direction of Tardy Furniture. Yet he says he wasn't ever there.

His statement is specific. As a matter of fact, he says he didn't even get up until 9:30 that morning in his statement. Now you have heard testimony from a defense witness that oh, yeah, he was at his sister's house about 9:15. Look at his statement that he gave Jack Matthews. He says he didn't even get up until 9:30. He says he went to his sister's house at 11 or 12 something, and then he went to the store after 12:00. That witness isn't even consistent with his own statement that he gave.

This case was a terrible case because of four people being killed, but it's a case that because of a good law enforcement work, they were able to put it together. Every possible person that they could find that might have seen him was interviewed. And because of people in the community being honest and saying yes, I saw him; some may say, I don't want to be involved, but yes, I saw him. And you heard them come on this stand and testify to that. Not only can we put him at the car that the gun was taken out of and knowing it was in there, we can put him going back to town after he got the gun. Ms. Beneva Henry saw him at her house walking down Campbell Street. Then right on down the street from her house Mary Jeanette Fleming saw him. You heard Mary Jeanette say that when she walked on up the street

Final Argument by Mr. Evans after seeing him, Ms. Beneva Henry was still sitting on her porch. And one thing I think she said was very important. You know, everybody laughed; it was funny at the time, but it's very important. She said it didn't matter if he was naked; she knew who he was.

I think all of y'all have seen me throughout this whole trial. You could probably say without a doubt that I was here last Friday, but how many of you could say specifically which suit or what clothes I was wearing that Friday? You probably couldn't. I couldn't. I don't even remember myself, but I remember seeing y'all here last Friday. These witnesses went through what they saw. These witnesses told what they knew.

Something else that was very important and very good police work. These officers didn't just go in and tramp all over the scene. They go in and they find evidence, and they preserve it. The bloody tennis shoe tracks are very important because they were left in blood. We know that whoever did it did it at the time of the shootings. These tracks are in blood on the floor, and you heard the expert, Joe Andrews, say that those tracks are exactly consistent with having been made by a pair of Fila Grant Hill II, 10 1/2 shoes, the same kind of shoes, the same kind of shoe box that was found at the house he was living in.

Now his girlfriend wants to come into court and say oh, he didn't wear a size ten and a half. He wore a size 11, and that's exactly why we brought the shoes in that were taken off his feet to show who was telling the truth. Jack Matthews was telling the truth, and Joe Andrews was telling

Final Argument by Mr. Evans the truth. Joe Andrews with the lab said he looked at those other shoes; they were 10 1/2's. But she wants you to believe he doesn't wear a 10 1/2; he wears an 11.

Something else, and Defense is going to argue oh, it wasn't but one particle. Gunshot residue on his hand is very important, on the back of his right hand. Now one thing else that is very important and the experts, both experts that have testified on that agree; you can say to 100 percent certainty also, nothing in this world resembles gunshot residue. When you have those same characteristics and same shape, it can be nothing else in the world but gunshot residue from a primer of a gun. You have heard the experts testify. If you fire a gun with your right hand, where would you expect to find the gunshot residue? On the back of your right hand. And that's where it was.

We are talking about some four hours later. We are lucky that they were still able to find some on his hand because the experts say even if he hadn't washed his hands, just sticking them in his pockets and all, he is going to lose most of it. So we were lucky that we found that, but we did, again by good police work because they, as soon as they got an opportunity, they checked to see if it was on his hands, and it was.

Porky Collins. Y'all heard his testimony even though he is now deceased. We were able to read his testimony into the record. That morning he saw the Defendant on Front Street. Now they started saying things like well, you said it looked like him. You said it could be him. I pointed out numerous places in there where he said, That is

Final Argument by Mr. Evans
the man I saw. We have got him on Front Street walking in
the direction of the store. And then to me, another one of
the most important witnesses in the whole case is Clemmie
Fleming. Not only do we have him walking toward the store on
Front Street, where he says he never was, but we have got him
running, running wide open at the back of Tardy's heading
down the street, running away from the store. We have got
him going to the store. We have got him running away from
the store.

I want to go over just a few things with you.

(NOTE: Mr. Evans puts up easel with sketch pad in front of the jury and writes on it.)

6:30 to 6:45 in the morning the day of the murders, Elaine Gholston. She sees him sitting out on his porch.

Again, remember he says he didn't get up until 9:30. And she can testify that she knew he wore Fila Grant Hills. She had seen him wearing them before. Before that, approximately four something, Patricia Hallmon saw him outside about 4:45.

7:15: Katherine Snow. She sees him at Angelica leaning up against the car.

7:30 to 8 o'clock, sometime after 7:30: Edward Lee McChristian. He sees him walking away from the direction of Angelica coming down Academy Street. Yet he wasn't on that side of the highway. That is another witness that is lying on him.

Approximately 7:30: Patricia Hallmon. She sees him coming back to his house. Yet according to him, he never left there. And she knows that he had on Fila Grant Hills that morning.

Final Argument by Mr. Evans Patricia sees him leave again. That is when he 8 o'clock. is heading back to the store. This first trip is when he goes to get the gun. He goes back home. Then he leaves his house again and heads back downtown to Tardy's. 9:00 to 9:45: That's when Ms. Beneva Henry, she sees him walk by her house. After 9 o'clock right down the street in sight of where each other would have seen him, Mary Jeanette Fleming. She sees him right down the street from Ms. Beneva

Somewhere around 9:30: Porky Collins sees him on Front Street walking in the direction of Tardy's.

Henry's house.

Approximately 10 o'clock: Clemmie Fleming sees him running away from Tardy's.

10:30: Chief Hargrove walks in the store and sees the body.

There is the time line right there that shows you exactly what happened that day.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a case that you have a couple of options, but if you follow the instructions that the Judge gives you, there can only be one verdict in this case, and that is that the Defendant is guilty of capital murder because he did, in fact, take the money from the store, and that's what makes it a capital murder.

Everyone involved in this case did an excellent job of helping preserve the crime scene, the evidence that was there, from Sam Jones, who walked in and found them, Chief Hargrove. Chief Hargrove did an excellent job of protecting the scene until other investigators from the crime lab got there. You heard Melissa Schoene; she was at the time the expert with the state crime lab. She went step by step with

Final Argument by Mr. Evans you through what was done to protect the evidence. She is the one that took the photographs of the bloody shoe prints that Joe Andrews was able to match. She, excuse me -- she is the one that recovered the hulls, the projectiles and the other evidence at the scene. And you have also heard and really, the main way you heard it was from the Defendant's own statement. He was let go from Tardy's Furniture. He had hauled some batteries. He had caused them to fall off the truck and was going to have to pay for them. He had worked four days, and other than the \$30.00 advance he had gotten, he wasn't going to get paid for those four days. statement, I don't remember the number of times -- you can look back through it -- but if I'm not mistaken, it says something about, about four different times that he had called Ms. Tardy during that time. You can look at the statement. You don't have to go by my memory. He was mad because he wasn't going to get that paycheck.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

He didn't go back in because she wasn't going to give him that paycheck, and he sat there and stewed over it for several days. He went back down to Tardy's. He shot these four people after he got the gun out of his uncle's vehicle, and he took the money out of the cash register, the money that he thought he was owed. He took that money.

Sheriff Thornburg. Sheriff Thornburg was involved in helping to prove what gun was used. He is one of the ones that went and dug the bullet, two bullets out of the post where Doyle had shot it. You heard him testify. You heard Jack Matthews testify about how that was done. That was good police work. That was things that a lot of times would be

Final Argument by Mr. Evans overlooked, but they were thinking. They were trying to say well, if the gun has been disposed of, how can we prove what murder weapon was used, and they did. They proved to 100 percent certainty what weapon was used without even recovering the weapon, and that is good work. Sheriff Thornburg was also one of the ones involved in recovering the Fila Grant Hill II tennis shoe box. The shoes may be gone, but we have got the box they were in. So we know that those shoes were there, the same kind of shoes that Joe Andrews has said left those bloody shoe prints.

The Defense put on the Defendant's girlfriend.

Basically, what she said was, I left going to work that morning, and I didn't see him again until that evening. I kept bows in that box. That is what the box was doing there.

I kept Christmas bows in it.

Y'all heard Sheriff Thornburg, and you are the ones that can determine who has a reason to tell the truth and who has a reason to lie. Sheriff Thornburg said it wasn't nothing in that box when he first saw it, nothing. But they were sharp enough -- as you have heard from Jack and Joe Andrews, again good police work. They started that day going to shoe stores, doing different things to determine. They wanted to know what kind of shoe left this print, what size shoe left this print. Which direction do we need to go from here? And they didn't just do a little and stop. They followed up on it all the way, all the way to the point that the Fila factory sent Joe Andrews the exact same kind of soles that would have been on the shoes in that box. He explained to you how he was able to match it.

Final Argument by Mr. Evans

You also heard testimony from somebody else. You heard testimony from Odell Hallmon. That is Patricia's brother. You heard how the Defendant asked him to lie, to make up a story to try to discredit Patricia because she was such a good witness against him. But remember what all she could say. She could say he wore Fila Grant Hills. He had them on that day. She saw him at 4:45. She saw him leave his house at 7:30 -- no, saw him come back to his house at 7:30; saw him leave the house again at 8 o'clock. It's very obvious why he wanted to discredit her.

But what did Odell tell you? He said, yeah, he asked me to make up a statement to help him lie and discredit my sister, but it wasn't true. And I asked him, Did he ever say anything to you about the crime? What did he say? Yeah, he told me he killed the people in the store there. Asked him to lie and admitted to him that he did it.

Ladies and gentlemen, as the Judge told you and I told you, the burden of proof is on the State of Mississippi in this case or any case, same burden of proof whether it's a grand larceny or a capital murder. That burden is only beyond a reasonable doubt. That does not mean that you have to have a videotape of the crime scene to convict. That means if we have convinced a reasonable jury beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty, he is guilty.

I submit to you that we have gone further than that. When you look at the evidence that we have given the jury, you look at all of the witnesses that have put him in these different places -- going to where the gun was, going away from where the gun was, walking toward town, in front of

Final Arguments by Evans - by Carter
Tardy's, running away from the crime scene, having the kind
of shoes that left the tracks, having gunshot residue on his
hand, telling folks, telling Odell Hallmon that he killed the
people in the store; ladies and gentlemen, this Defendant is
guilty of capital murder. The reason he is guilty is because
he went in that store and killed four people on July 16,
1996. And we are asking you when you go back in the jury
room to deliberate, to return a verdict of guilty of capital
murder on all four charges because that's what he is guilty
of. Thank you, Your Honor.

(Mr. Carter puts large photographs of Doyle Simpson's car on easel in front of the jury.)
FINAL ARGUMENT BY MR. CARTER:

Good afternoon. The only excellence that went on at that crime scene was done by Melissa Schoene. And the only other excellence that went on this case was done by the Mississippi Crime Lab. Sheriff Thornburg said this is Doyle's car. The car is brown. And the good Lord shines this perfect shadow on this car from right here to right here. And that is not another color, but it is perfect sunlight; a shadow is also underneath this car. It would take an absolute blind person to not see that this car is two colors. You have to lie to say that car is one color.

Mr. Evans apparently would believe anything. He believes his witnesses, despite how they testified. He still believes them. I will make every effort to talk slow -- I have a habit of talking fast -- so that you can understand me. The prosecution wants you to believe that it was a clear and sunny day, and the sky is blue, but they can't explain

Final Argument by Mr. Carter
the clouds or the constant rainfall. The prosecution wants
you to believe it was a clear day and it was sunny, and the
sky was blue. But you know it can't be a clear day and it
can't be sunny if it keeps raining, and you see clouds
everywhere. And I'm not gullible enough to believe that, and
I don't believe that you are because we know that can't
happen.

It doesn't matter how many times you repeat a lie. A lie is a lie the first time; it's a lie if you tell it 20 times, if you tell it a hundred times. And repeating the same lie over and over does not matter. You are here today facing the awesome responsibility of deciding Mr. Flowers' fate. And I have awesome responsibility of representing him, and it certainly is an awesome responsibility.

Mr. Flowers is accused of killing four people, and the death of four people is enough to affect anybody. I told you when I heard about this case, I said I didn't want no part of it. And I'm frankly amazed that I'm the lawyer, but once I got the case and I read the facts, I didn't have any reticence from that time on. It is natural to feel great sympathy and empathy for the victims, victims and their families of the victims because that was a horrific crime scene, no doubt about it. You can't take that away. I won't even waste my time trying because I'm too humane for that.

But your job is not to bring relief to the families. That is not your job. Your job is to listen to the evidence and decide guilt or innocence of Mr. Flowers.

Your job is to decide whether Mr. Evans proved guilt beyond a reasonable doubt or he didn't prove it. The prosecutors' job

Final Argument by Mr. Carter is to do justice, not to just seek a conviction. That is their charge, and while it's not my charge, I make an effort to seek justice also because I believe a trial is a search for the truth. And the truth just doesn't run out. You have to knock it out sometimes. You have to hammer it out and beat it out of people. That's how you get the truth. That's why you have cross-examination because people will come and lie.

I would be quite surprised if you didn't feel pressure, a lot of pressure because you have got the great responsibility. But you have to try to make your decision based on the evidence and not on any outside influences. That is your charge. That's what you said you could do. I believe it takes great courage and conviction to sit in judgment on this case because there is so much temptation; there is so much hurt involved in this case. Jury duty is not for the scary and the faint of heart. I have been a lawyer for over 20 years and I have talked to a lot of people, a lot of jurors, and I have learned that people want people just like them to decide their fate.

And I have also learned that almost everybody has some fear of people unlike them deciding their fate. And when I speak of unlike, I'm speaking of political parties, a lot of things, races, sexes, social, economic groups, and so on. And as a lawyer, we try to make some effort to accommodate a person, but most of all, we are looking for a fair and impartial jury. That is most of all what I think everybody wants. Only you know whether you can be fair and impartial, and I have no reason to doubt it. I pray, I beg

Final Argument by Mr. Carter you to be fair and impartial. I have no reason to doubt it.

Nobody has told you this, but you are the most powerful entity in this courtroom right now. You have more power than the Judge, more power than me, and that may shock you. More power than Mr. Evans; that may shock you because you decide what happens to Mr. Flowers. And you don't get a chance to go to law school like I did, like Mr. Evans did, like the Judge did, like Mr. de Gruy and Ms. Ferraro and like Mr. Hill. You show up one day and you get picked, and this great responsibility is thrown upon you, and you have got to handle it.

I know you have heard this before, but with great power comes great responsibility because nobody wants to be accused of abusing responsibility, especially a great responsibility on a case like this. So you should be asking yourself, How can I be fair? How can I do what is right? How can I not abuse this responsibility? How can I make sure that I make my decision on the evidence and not on anything else?

The prosecution has to prove their case. Mr. Fleming-- Mr. Flowers doesn't have to prove anything. The Judge has told you that that is just the way it is. That is the way our system works. And if Mr. Evans doesn't do his job, you don't have to excuse him. You shouldn't excuse him. You don't have to make excuses for him. Our system depends on ordinary citizens to decide what happens to us; ordinary citizens just like you, so you don't need no law degree. You don't need to be taught how to do this. You just have, need the willingness to do what is right, to follow the

Final Argument by Mr. Carter instructions to do your job. That's all we could ask.

I realize the death of four people is a hard thing to reconcile. I mean I know it is. When we hear of crime, I want to tell you a little something. Every time I hear of a crime, a horrendous crime, I get mad, and I wish bad things upon the person who did it, and I'm a lawyer and been doing it a long time. And I have to make myself stand back and realize I don't even know the facts. I don't know what happened. I just heard of something. And although this is a horrendous crime, a horrendous crime and I know that it has to affect you greatly, you have got to step back and be fair and be objective and make a decision based on the evidence. You can't just act on emotion.

This case is not about me and Mr. Evans. We just happened to be the fortunate or unfortunate people that happen to be here. It's not about the prosecution versus the defense. It's not necessarily about good versus evil. This case is about justice and proof beyond a reasonable doubt or the lack of proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now let's talk about the facts of the case. Curtis Flowers is charged. The government called, I believe 19 people. They called Sam Jones, Chief Johnny Hargrove, Barry Eskridge, Dr. Steven Hayne, Melissa Schoene, Bill Thornburg, David Balash, Katherine Snow, Beneva Henry, Edward McChristian, Doyle Simpson, Elaine Gholston, Mary Jeanette Fleming, Clemmie Fleming, Patricia Hallmon Sullivan, Charles "Porky" Collins, Jack Matthews, Roxanne Ballard, Odell Hallmon, and Joe Andrews and Mr. Keenum; I can't think of his first name. And we called Essa Ruth Campbell, Connie Moore,

Final Argument by Mr. Carter
Billy Glover, Latarsha Blissett, Mary Fleming, Sam Jones
[sic], and Mike McSparrin.

Before we get there though, I told you from the beginning that they didn't have a single person who could say that they saw Mr. Flowers go in and come out of that store, and they still haven't. After all of this, they still haven't because they don't have. And despite all the good work that Dr. Hayne and Melissa Schoene, Mr. Andrews did, not a single one of those experts can say or performed any work that showed that Curtis Flowers went in that store and committed those murders, not a single one of them.

I told you in the opening statements this case is not about who did it; it's about who could have done it. And all they have shown you is who could have; that he was one of several persons who could have, but they cannot show you that he did, in fact, do it. I told you; I knew they couldn't.

Let's talk about what Mr. Jones said. Mr. Jones came to Tardy's that morning. He was in the front of the store, the side of the store, back behind the store. He drove there. He never saw anybody running, walking, or standing anywhere nearby Tardy's, and he is the person that found the parties. And he drove down Summit, Church, Carrollton; yet he never saw anything. He saw the fingerprints when he went in the second time.

Chief Johnny Hargrove apparently didn't make any notes of what he saw and what he found. He relied on his memory, a dangerous thing because the memory, memory fades. That's just the way it is. No list of people who came in and went out. They certainly never showed me one that he made.

Final Argument by Mr. Carter
And there is some question about whether he checked any
footprints or not. I believe he said he did, but if I'm not
mistaken, Mr. Eskridge got up and said he thinks his got
checked later by somebody else, and the EMT's were checked
later by somebody, not by Mr. Hargrove. But I believe, if
I'm not mistaken -- rely on your own judgment, but I believe
he said he checked them. If I'm wrong, I apologize.

And there was one picture where I asked every one of those police officers, Who are those people standing out front at that tape? Not a single one of them knew who was there because they made no lists. They want you to -- they are going to come in here and want you to believe their memories eight years ago. That's why you write things down. You have got to be a moron to think that you don't have to make notes so that you can memorialize what happened and just rely on your memory. Yet somebody's life is hanging in the balance.

Mr. Eskridge said no one checked his shoes at the scene, but maybe later; didn't see anyone check the EMT's shoes. In fact, he walked around and apparently helped Mr. Hargrove look around, which I think is a noble thing to do. I mean if you are courageous enough to do that considering, you know, the crime scene.

Dr. Hayne came here and explained to you how these people died. I mean I know that was a touching, hurting thing. It affected me too and -- but you have got to put that in perspective, and that is not to say that I am discounting the murders because I can't do that. I wouldn't be stupid enough and inhumane enough to try to do that.

Final Argument by Mr. Carter

Melissa Schoene said she lifted fingerprints, I think, from the store and from the car. She said the contents of the safe were neat and orderly, and no evidence nobody went through those. She photographed the keys off of Ms. Rigby's hand, but they were apparently on her hand at some point, which means somebody moved them, kicked them, or did something to move them around in there, which means the crime scene wasn't really protected like they claim it was because had it been protected, the keys would have still been on her hand.

And there was never any tape put up in the building to mark off these tracks, but I'm glad they were able to get They did a decent job considering that, I would argue. The money was still in Mr. Rigby's purse, still in Mr. Golden's pocket, and I believe still in Ms. Tardy's purse. And Mr. Flowers' check was still left there. make all this fuss about Mr. Flowers' check. We saw the check sitting right there by the phone. There was never any proof. Did you see anything written on that check where she was going to take that check or deduct that check? I mean there is no real expressed proof that that really, that she was going to actually take it. Of course, she told Mr. Flowers that, but as far as looking at the check and making a big thing out of it, the check-- all the check means is that he worked there at some point, which we know.

Mr. Thornburg. No one told him to look out for the footprints. He saw the footprints on his own. He went to Connie's house with Jerry Butler looking for gym shoes. He saw the shoe box, but he didn't get it, and he didn't check

Final Argument by Mr. Carter for any clothes or search the house or anything even though this man was a suspect apparently, but that is still excellent police work according to Mr. Evans. Didn't look for the gun or anything else; went back a second time but didn't even go in and get the box. The lady went and got the box and came and brought it to him.

And they said they knew kind of early on that it was Grant Hill Fila shoes. If they knew it was Grant Hill Fila shoes that left that print, why didn't they get the box earlier? They probably didn't know. He saw Emmett Simpson running. He said Emmett was perspiring. Doyle lied to him about where he got the gun from.

We had David Balash. David Balash said, he explained to you how you can get gunshot residue. And he also said you can get it a lot of ways other than shooting a gun. As a matter of fact, I believe he said, if I'm not mistaken -- rely on your own memory -- that he wouldn't conclude of any person that has fired a weapon unless he sees more than 100 particles, not just one like Mr. Andrews found. He also said that gunshot residue can easily be transferred from shaking hands, people with ink pens and various other things that has gunshot residue on it. And he said there is no test that can show that a person absolutely fired a gun.

Katherine Snow claimed she was afraid to get involved. Afraid of what? I asked her. She couldn't tell even tell us. She was just afraid, and she never told anybody that before as far as I know. But all of a sudden she is afraid when she is up there, when she is being crossexamined. Admitted that she knew Curtis before this and saw

Final Argument by Mr. Carter
Curtis out there. She talked to the police three times, I
believe, before she told the police that she saw Curtis out
there. By the time she talked to the police and told them
about Curtis, the reward was available. She admitted that.
Said she saw a person that was 5'3" to 5'5" with a white
shirt; didn't notice shoes or pants. She didn't tell Doyle
she saw Curtis either. She just gave a description.

Then we have got Ms. Henry. Ms. Henry came here and she said she saw Mr. Flowers. I don't doubt that she might have seen Mr. Flowers at some point; I really don't, because people -- she admits that she had seen him many times walking. She said he had on white shorts on that occasion, and he was walking on Campbell. Maybe that happened at some point, but she didn't know where he went. She couldn't say he went to Tardy's. They said he was walking normally, didn't see anything abnormal about him.

Mr. McChristian came in, Edward McChristian. He said he saw Curtis walking on South Academy. He couldn't say anything about the clothing; said it was common for people to walk that way all the time. He saw Curtis between 7:30 and 8:00, right around the same time that Katherine Snow saw him, so he was doing a lot of moving around, or either he was at two places at one time.

Doyle Simpson put the gun in his glove box the night before the murders. He told us that and told us that he never told Curtis he put the gun in there. Yet Mr. Evans said Curtis knew the gun was in there. It is all right for Mr. Evans to say because he didn't need facts to say those kind of things. He just wants to say that and hope that you

Final Argument by Mr. Carter will believe it. He said he went to his car about 9:15 to get his breakfast, I believe, went back around 10:25, I believe, to let his windows down. He didn't notice the gun missing until the third time. He was going to pick up lunches, I believe. He admitted that there was about a 45 minute period of time when he wasn't at work. He was unaccounted for from my perspective. He lied about where he purchased the gun; called his brother and tried to get his brother to lie for him. Katherine Snow told him that the person she saw, I think it was short, heavy, had a hat on with white shirt, but gave no name. And she saw the person around 7:15, I believe.

And Doyle couldn't help, he couldn't explain how lying about the gun was supposed to help Curtis. I mean I don't understand that, and I can understand why it might help him because he claimed he was being harassed. But I don't see how it matters whether you got the gun from your brother or you got it from anybody else. I mean the reason he lied about that, I just don't understand. And he didn't sufficiently explain it to me.

Okay, we had Elaine Gholston who came in, said she saw Curtis wearing Grant Hill Filas, but I asked her another question about what she told somebody else. She said it was months and months before the killings; couldn't remember anything else he had on when she saw him with these tennis shoes on; had known him for about seven years and couldn't remember any other type of shoes that he had on, so I guess he had them for seven years, all he wore. But she only saw them one time. Couldn't remember what they specifically

Final Argument by Mr. Carter looked like or how he wore them. And she said she never saw Patricia Hallmon walking early in the morning.

Then we had Mary Jeanette Fleming. I don't know what to say about her except I know you remember her. And I do too and I will never forget her probably. But she gave one description in court about what she said he had on, but if you take the evidence back in the room with you, you are going to find out that she gave a different description when the police talked to her. I tried to get her to admit it, but she wouldn't do it. The statement is in evidence. Read it and you will see where she made two different statements about what he had on.

Then we had Clemmie Fleming, who said she hired Mr. Harris to take her to Tardy's. She said they went there, and they sat out front. And although she had a bill to pay, she was too sick to go in and pay it, but she didn't go to the doctor. She went over to her sister's house and didn't tell her sister she was sick. And she owed for furniture at Tardy's which she has never paid to this day. Tardy's no longer calls her or go to ask her for the money. The debt was forgiven, just like Latarsha Blissett said because she testified in a helpful fashion.

And she said Curtis was on the left side of the vehicle. She had to look across Mr. Harris to see him, I believe. And he drove on and this person, Mr. Flowers was running so fast that apparently he got to 51 before they could drive to 51.

Patricia Hallmon. She saw Curtis on the porch with blue shorts, smoking a cigarette around 4:45. She saw him

Final Argument by Mr. Carter again about 7:30 running from over the hill with black nylon pants that zip up; stayed in the house 20 minutes; left again with the same attire on, but didn't see him return; never saw a weapon or any blood or any evidence of any crime. And apparently, she saw Curtis right around the same time that, or near the same time that Mr. McChristian saw him.

Then we had Charles "Porky" Collins, whose testimony you heard read. It was long, and hopefully, you were able to listen to it and it didn't unnecessarily distract you. I realize it is probably not as exciting as having a witness testify, hearing us read something. He said he saw two men in front of Tardy's, said they were medium skin. That's the first thing he said. He said he only got a brief or a split second look at one of the men. He didn't see the other one's face, and when he was first showed a lineup, he picked Doyle Simpson out. Later on, after the good doctor, Mr. Johnson, finished with him, he picked out Curtis Flowers.

Now if you remember well, Mr. Collins admitted or he was shown through cross-examination that he had a bad memory, and his perception might have been skewed. He said he saw these two men making hand gestures, thought they were fixing to fight, couldn't identify any clothing or other definite details of the people.

Then we had Mr. Jack Matthews, who relied on his great memory too, because that's all you need apparently. He failed to photograph several things. He said he saw the keys on Ms. Rigby's hand. He interviewed Mary Jeanette Fleming. He pointed out the inconsistency in Curtis Flowers'

Final Argument by Mr. Carter Curtis gave him two statements. The first time statement. he came he gave them one, according to Mr. Matthews. second time he saw him he gave him another. Curtis Flowers probably didn't know he was a suspect the first time the police called him. But when they called him back again, I think he knew he was a suspect. Any young man would have been tempted, especially if they started telling you when a crime occurred and what happened, to try to curtail or change your testimony to make it fit whatever they are talking about because he didn't want to be charged. That is just a fact. They can put whatever spin they want to put on it. stop them; I won't even try. But if Mr. Flowers killed the people, then he know what time he killed them. He could have told them, give them the right information the first time. He wouldn't have had to change it because if he had been there, he would have known when it occurred.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

And Mr. Matthews also admitted that Doyle lied to him; admitted that they never found the tennis shoes; never found the gun; never found the clothing. And I don't have anything bad to say about them not finding this, those items because I believe if they could have found them, they would have, and they tried probably. But he couldn't identify some of the people at the scene also because he was relying on his memory instead of making notes like he should have been doing.

And ladies and gentlemen, you had Odell Hallmon to come here, the snitch, the informant, and Mr. Evans believes him too although he knows this man has testified and given information differently before; although he knows Odell had

Final Argument by Mr. Carter written a letter to Mr. Flowers' mother apologizing to her for lying, for getting his sister to lie; although he knows Mr. Flowers [sic] has denied on two tapes that Curtis Flowers told him that he killed these people. But Mr. Evans put him up here anyway. He doesn't care. That is not him that is on trial. But you notice Odell didn't provide any detail as to when, where, how or why those murders occurred that Mr. Flowers supposedly told him about.

And the Judge gave you a cautionary instruction about how to view Mr. Hallmon's testimony because the man is a snitch. He will do anything for some kind of favor, and I do mean anything. And don't forget where he was living, where he lives now.

Now Mr. Joe Andrews, the shoe print guy, did good work from what I could see, and he said that that shoe print was left. He proved scientifically that that print that was left there was done by a Fila that was either 10, 11, or a 10 1/2. But even he doesn't know who committed those murders, and he absolutely cannot say Mr. Flowers did it. He admitted that.

And he found this one particle of gunshot residue, the smallest amount that the microscope will pick up apparently and they can still say that it's gunshot residue. But even he admits you can get, gunshot residue is easily transferred, and you can get it almost any kind of way. And he said that you can never say absolutely a person fired a gun. Now he sent the shoebox on for fingerprints to be taken of it.

Then we had Ms. Campbell to come in here, who is

Final Argument by Mr. Carter Dovle Simpson's sister, who had this car sitting at her house more times than she can count, who told you what color the car is, a car that you can see with your own eyes what color it is. And she said she saw her brother driving his car somewhere between 9:00 and 10:00. She was able to see that. And we had Connie Moore who came in and said she bought her son some Fila Grant Hill shoes. In fact, she said she bought two pair. And Mr. Evans couldn't bring anybody here and controvert her testimony, so he tried to talk to her in a condescending manner, tried to make her look like a liar without any proof. She said she had three sons. She had a son Marcus who had left to live with his daddy; had another son named Lemarcus who was living there, and they claimed they checked his shoe and it was size seven. Mr. Evans is going to stand up here and try to make you think that Lemarcus was Marcus. They are two different people.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

And we had Billy Glover to come in here. Billy Glover said he saw Mr. Flowers because it rained that morning and they know he wasn't going to be able to work because they worked outside, so he went over to Priscilla's house, and Mr. Flowers came by there about 9:15. They talked about 15 or 20 minutes.

We had Latarsha Blissett to come here. The child was in high school, and Mr. Johnson, the great Mr. Johnson, John Johnson went and got her, picked her up, didn't even tell her parents, her mom and dad; put her in a car and took her to Greenville and interviewing this child and asking her what \$30,000 can do. That will get you a mobile home. That is low down. And Clemmie also told her that she lied and

Final Argument by Mr. Carter that she would tell the truth and that she told just to get her furniture paid for.

Now we have Mary Ella Fleming, who came here and said her sister came to her house, and her sister didn't say anything about being down at Tardy's or seeing anything before she got in the car and took her sister back down there, and they realized that something had happened down there. Her own sister.

And we had Mr. Roy Harris to come in, a man that doesn't hear good and a man that is illiterate, I hate to say, said he couldn't read. And he talked to Mr. Johnson; he talked to him twice. He talked to Mr. Johnson the first time; Mr. Johnson did not tape the statement, and he did not write it out because he didn't want to hear what he had to say the first time. But he called him back later after he had talked to Clemmie Fleming, and he realized what Clemmie Fleming said. Then he goes and get Mr. Harris back in there and make Mr. Harris say what Clemmie Fleming said. That's what he did. That is what I know he did. I'm sorry I couldn't be there so I could prove it any better, but I know that is what happened.

And out of all the statements Mr. Evans pulled up and said you said this on this day, and you said this on that day, he never wanted to talk about that first statement that Mr. Harris gave though because he knows Mr. Harris told Johnson that he went down there twice. The first time he was by himself, and that's when he saw a guy running, and he gave a description of the guy he running, he saw running, a light skinned guy. That is oldest trick in the world. If you are

Final Argument by Mr. Carter telling me something I don't want to hear, I'm not going to write it down. I'm not going to take it, but when I get you to say what I want you to say, I'm going to tape it because I want some record of it. And you don't have to believe what I'm saying, but I know I'm right, and I know that is what happened. Use your own judgment; you can ignore me with respect to that because that is just my opinion.

Who can you trust if you can't trust the police, if the police would lie? The police has a lot of power, and Mr. Evans has a lot of power. I mean they can go and flash that badge and make a person come out of the house and talk to them. They can make a person go down to the precinct and talk to them whether you want to go or not. I can't do that as a defense attorney. But they can do it, and they should not abuse that power.

And then we had Larry Keenum, the person that is supposed to account for Doyle Simpson's whereabouts. Doyle Simpson was a possible suspect. They never ruled Doyle Simpson out. You know how they rule him out? They rule him out on one of his co-workers, a guy named Mr. Keenum. They didn't even get a statement from Mr. Keenum. They have nothing in writing, nothing on tape, nothing to prove that this man was actually there. Then they are going to bring him here and let him testify from his memory that he was there, that he remembered. What kind of alibi is that? You can't even prove it. Anybody can come in and lie and say that. And they know it is wrong.

And we had Mike McSparrin to come here and say he tested the box and various other things, and he found no

Final Argument by Mr. Carter scientific evidence to connect Mr. Flowers to this crime.

Ladies and gentlemen, the people either saw

Mr. Flowers on different days, or they are lying to get

money. I can't be real sure what it is. I am sure some of

them are lying to get money, to get advantages. I told you

in the beginning that you would find a shotty and incompetent

investigation to some degree, and you would find witness

intimidation, and I believe the facts will bear every single

one of those out. And I also told you that this case was

going to be about who could have done it and not who did it,

and I believe the facts have beared that out too.

If they saw Mr. Flowers on the same day, why do we have so many different clothing descriptions of what he had on? And we know Mr. Flowers didn't likely outrun that truck. I don't really know why Mr. Flowers changed his story. As a lawyer, I don't get a chance to see what happens. All I do is the best I can to try to bring out the truth during the trial. That's all I can do, and try to put a story together based on what happened. I would never stand before you and tell you absolutely that I know what happened because I don't know. I am unlike Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans can do that, but Mr. Evans is not there either. He doesn't see it either. I don't believe that the prosecution has proved their case by trustworthy and reliable evidence. I just can't see that.

Now Mr. Evans gets a chance to come behind me, and I don't care what I say to you, he is going to come up behind me, and he is going to say something different. And he is going to try to make it look like I can't possibly know what I'm talking about, but I have made my best effort to be

Final Arguments by Mr. Carter - by Mr. de Gruy
honest and be clear to you. It is important that a police
investigation be objective, that it be based on trustworthy
and reliable evidence. Otherwise the possibility of error is
so great, and with this kind of case, the punishment is just
too great to make mistakes, to cavalierly judge somebody;
it's too great to not care.

You have been forced to rely to a large degree on the memories of people rather than written proof that was collected and made way back around the time it occurred. That is not your fault, and it's not my fault either. I don't know if I have ever heard anybody say they checked Doyle Simpson's shoes or Emmett Simpson's shoes. I don't know if I have heard anybody say they checked Doyle Simpson's house for evidence, or either Emmett Simpson. Maybe they did, but I don't remember hearing anybody. But they zeroed in on Mr. Flowers and said to hell with everybody else more or less. That's the way it looks to me.

Mr. Flowers doesn't have to prove anything. That is just the way it is. Mr. Evans has the burden of proof. I thank you, and I believe that you are honest and fair and courageous enough to go back and do the right thing.

BY MR. DE GRUY: May it please the Court.

FINAL ARGUMENT BY MR. DE GRUY:

Good afternoon. I know y'all have been here a long time just this afternoon, and you have certainly been here a long time since we got started last week. And I think you will recall when we spoke last week, we were telling you during jury selection that what we were looking for were fair, objective people. I think you will recall, some of you

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy started on the first day. Some of you started on Wednesday and even on Thursday. From well over 300 people, it came down to you. We trusted you from what you were telling us, and we are about to entrust you in the case, with the case. And I'm going to have to sit down, and I promise you; I'm not going to be here very long. But I think you can understand why I'm a little reluctant to just sit down leaving something unsaid.

I know that y'all have been paying attention, and we truly appreciate that. And I have noticed the note taking, and I know you are interested in this case and interested in the facts. And we know and we trust that you are going to go back into the jury room and carefully do your best to remember this evidence. And you also told us during the jury selection process, and it's just as important, that you would follow the law that was given to you by the Judge. And I'm going to just tell you; I'm not going to read back through it. And I noticed y'all were paying attention when he read it. And you know that you get to take it back with you, and so I am asking you to read through the law carefully.

I would just like to take just a couple of moments to go through some of these instructions that you will have with you and relate them to the facts that we heard. And to start with, jury instruction number 1. It's a lengthy instruction. It is almost three pages long, and it basically goes back through everything we talked about for four days of jury selection - what we asked if you could do and what you assured us you could. It comes down to the final paragraph

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy that is, I think what explains to you that awesome responsibility that Mr. Carter was talking about.

The ultimate decision you make in this case is your decision, each one of you. You talk among each other. You discuss; I have no doubt you will argue. But ultimately, each one of you owes everyone else the respect that you want in the decision. The final decision that you return into this court is going to be your decision.

The instruction number 4: Again, Mr. Carter mentioned this. It's what I refer to as the Odell instruction. The Judge tells you what to do, how you view Odell Hallmon's testimony. It specifically says, "passing on what weight, if any, you should give this testimony, you must weigh it with great care and caution and look at it with distrust and suspicion." Twice when he is being videotaped after he said that he told the District Attorney's Office that there was this confession that he knew no details to; twice he admitted to you while being videotaped, no, he never did that. He never did confess to me.

The next instruction deals with identification, and it is a full page line that tells you, the Judge listed to you the things that you can consider because ultimately, you have to decide whether these witnesses who said, I saw Curtis Flowers, actually saw Curtis Flowers, whether they saw him on that day. You must consider the weeks or the months between when they say when they supposedly saw it and when they finally came forward and said anything. You consider the different and changing descriptions from 5'3", 5'4", maybe 5'5" up to 5'10", and the descriptions of the clothing was so

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy important and the changing descriptions in the clothing.

You won't take this list that Mr. Evans wrote out for you back with you, but something to think about, and I was making notes as he was reading it off. At these different times, it's interesting to also remember how he was dressed according to these witnesses. Ms. Snow at one time said a white shirt and black jeans. She also told Doyle Simpson he was wearing shorts. Mr. McChristian didn't see the clothing. Ms. Gholston said blue or black shorts.

Ms. Hallmon was positive, black nylon pants. Ms. Henry saw white shorts. Now Ms. Fleming, and you again can take her earlier statement back with you, black pants, purple jacket, dressy; brown pants, gray jacket. Clemmie Fleming paid attention to everything but the clothing.

And Mr. Collins didn't tell us what the clothing was, and I think unfortunately maybe for all of us, he wasn't here. But he sees him walking across the street at about the same time because it wasn't 9:30. We know it wasn't 9:30 because he was at Wal-Mart at 9:43. He sees a man calmly walking across the street and with another man, and he doesn't -- he identifies both Curtis Flowers, but previously, he had picked someone else out the first time he looked at a lineup. And his, from his testimony he was asked is there anything different about the picture of Curtis Flowers in that lineup than the other people, and he said yeah. It was close-up, real different from the other photos. He knew which picture to pick.

Now some of you when we were going through the jury selection process, we had discussions about the difference

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy will be the last instruction that the Court gave you. We have had in this case, as we talked about the clothing, a lot of inconsistent statements from the witnesses. They say one thing one time, another thing another time. Some of them like Ms. Fleming were a little reluctant to admit it. The Court instructed you on how you deal with that evidence, how you deal with the evidence that Doyle Simpson lied, that Ms. Snow said she knew Curtis from a singing group, but never, never said it was Curtis I saw until months later. She had talked to him two or three times before she said oh, it was Curtis Flowers.

Ms. Gholston and Ms. Hallmon said they had seen Curtis wearing Filas, but only once. They never remembered any other shoe he wore. These Nikes are in evidence. You can look at them and see how worn they are. They never saw him wear those. They only remember one day when he wore like new Filas, couldn't remember any other shoe they ever saw him wear.

Mr. Evans just told you Clemmie Fleming is one of his most important witnesses, and we brought in several people, and she herself had to admit she has given several different statements. You consider what she told Latarsha Blissett that she did not see Curtis. You consider what she didn't tell her sister. You know, her sister said, It's a good thing we weren't here this morning. She didn't say a word, never mentioned to her that she had been down there. Of course, we heard today the reason for that is because she wasn't down there. The reason she told Latarsha she didn't see Curtis Flowers is because she didn't see Curtis Flowers.

Final Argument by Mr. Evans

We are asking you to go back into the jury room, begin your difficult work, talk to each other, hold firm to the beliefs you have, and return a verdict of not guilty on all counts. Thank you.

FINAL ARGUMENT BY MR. EVANS:

Thank goodness the Judge told y'all that you couldn't rely on what we say on closing statement because my memory is a lot different on a lot of things that happened at trial than what theirs were. Y'all are the ones that base it on your decision. The reason we have juries is that so people can use their common sense and determine what happened in cases. You are not asked to sit up here and do anything other than that. You use your everyday good, common sense; you look at the facts of the case, and you determine what happened. And in this case that is not any close question. You know what happened.

Now they want to argue on the lesser included that if you believe that he just went to the store and killed them because he was mad, that is regular murder. Where the difference comes in, and it's the instruction the Court gave, if you believe that it was during the commission of a robbery, then it's capital murder; it's not regular murder. And the Court has instructed you on what robbery is; that "If you believe from all the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant Curtis Giovanni Flowers did, on or about the 16th, July the 16th, 1996, in Montgomery County, Mississippi, willfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with the felonious intent to permanently deprive the owner thereof, take, steal and carry away or attempt to take, steal

Final Argument by Mr. Evans and carry away the personal property of Bertha Tardy, doing business as Tardy Furniture store, from the presence of and against the will of Bertha Tardy by violence to her person with a deadly weapon, the same would constitute robbery."

It's that simple. That's the Court's instruction, and if he took the money by force or violence to her, that is robbery. That is what makes it capital robbery, and shooting her in the head, if that is not force to her, I don't know what would be.

They want to try to say that they discredited Clemmie by putting Roy Harris on. Y'all saw Roy Harris. It was obvious he wasn't going to answer anything I asked. He tried to act like he couldn't hear me, but he could hear the opposing counsel all the way on the other side of the courtroom. But one thing was very important; he admitted -- and I asked him about all four statements he had given. I didn't ask about one or two. He admitted that he said after they went around from Tardy Furniture Company, that Clemmie said, "There goes Curtis Flowers." That is their own witness.

Now they want to come up here and attack everybody except the Defendant. You take their version of it, every law enforcement officer in this case is a bunch of lying morons. That's what they said. I tell you that these officers did an excellent job. They followed the proper procedure, and if it wasn't for them following the proper procedure, we wouldn't know who killed all four people there. But they did, and they did a good job of it.

They want to talk about prints. Prints aren't

important in this case, and one reason they are not, we have got a public place; we know he was employed there. We know his prints would have been in the store. They found a few prints in different places. It was never said where the prints came from. It wasn't said they came from behind the counter. It was said they were prints recovered from the store. They weren't from the door area, but even if we had 14 of his prints in there, that wouldn't mean anything because he was an employee of the store. So that is no evidence one way or the other.

Odell Hallmon. They want to attack Odell, and the instructions given don't necessarily apply to one witness. They apply to the law. In the case of Odell, you have got to look at the circumstances. He told you that the Defendant had asked him to lie, make up a story on his own sister. So he started out a defense witness. He didn't start out on something we did. He started out trying to make one of our key witnesses out to look like a liar because this Defendant asked him to, to try to save his own neck. And when did he tell me? He didn't tell me while he was in jail wanting a favor. He talked to his mother about it. He came and called me after he got out of jail at a time he had no charges on him and said Curtis Flowers asked me to lie.

BY MR. CARTER: Your Honor, I object to that.

There is no proof of that.

BY MR. EVANS: It's in the record.

BY THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MR. EVANS:

Curtis Flowers asked me to lie for him and make up

Final Argument by Mr. Evans
this statement, but it wasn't true, and he admitted to me
that he killed the people at Tardy Furniture at a time that
he didn't have anything he wanted from me. He wasn't in any
trouble.

Jack Matthews testified that they followed up on proper procedure and were able to eliminate Doyle Simpson and Emmett Simpson as suspects in this case. They didn't just point in one direction. They checked everybody and everything that they could check on, and everything pointed back to Curtis.

Now they even want to argue that we can't prove that she was withholding his check, and that is in his own statement. Y'all have got his statement. It's in evidence. Y'all will have it back there if you don't remember what is in there. But it specifically says in there; it says: What time did you go to your girlfriend's house? About 11, 12 something. And you indicated you went to the store. What time did you go to the store? I imagine 12:30 or 12:45.

Now they say he wouldn't have done that if he had known he was a suspect. I submit he would have done exactly that. He wanted them to think that he was at home where they couldn't try to prove that he was lying because if he had said, I was at my sister's house at 9:15 while they had him at the police station, you know what they would have been doing? They would have sent somebody over there to the sister's house to find out, and they would have known he wasn't. That's why he said he was at home instead of trying to say he was over at his sister's house because he didn't have time to get somebody else to lie for him.

Final Argument by Mr. Evans

Y'all heard, even though it was long, y'all heard Porky's testimony. They are trying to say he picked out Doyle. He never anywhere in there said Doyle Simpson was in front of Tardy Furniture. He said the person that I saw was about this complexion. Something else. He said he is also about the complexion of Chief Johnny Hargrove. And then when he saw the other photo lineup, he said, That is him. That is him.

Ladies and gentlemen, these officers have no reason to lie to you. Randy Keenum has no reason to lie to you. None of these people have any reason to lie to you. They are telling you what happened.

They are showing you -- and this is not an exhibit. Y'all won't be able to take that back. I used it just to explain to you what the time line was. This helps show that nothing in his statement is believable. This shows all of the places where he was seen. It shows all of the people in the community that were honest enough to say yeah, it was him. Several of them have told you, I didn't want to be involved. Clemmie Fleming, what did she tell you? How did she get up here? Y'all remember what she said? She told a friend that she saw Curtis Flowers running from the store, and that friend called the officers and said, I want you to go talk to her. She wasn't going to tell it because she was scared, and she didn't want to get involved. But she told a friend right after it happened, and that friend was the one that got her testimony in.

Doyle didn't want to get his nephew in trouble.

You heard him say that. He also said, and I think this is

Final Argument by Mr. Evans important, that he already knew that Doyle had been identified at the time that he tried to put the gun as coming from somewhere else. He really didn't want to put that gun that committed the murders in his nephew's hand, but after they pinned him down on it, not only did he do that, but he was honest enough to carry them to where he had shot the gun, and they were able to match it, 100 percent sure. He didn't want to have to testify against his nephew, but he did.

Ladies and gentlemen, the facts are very clear in this case. This Defendant is guilty of four counts of capital murder. We have shown that to you from the witnesses, from the evidence in the case, and we ask that you go back in the jury room and return a verdict to the Court, We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of capital murder on all four counts.

The Judge is going to send a form back there with you. All you do is check the form, knock on the door and return into court. But one thing I want to emphasize at this point. The penalty has nothing to do with this point. As we told you earlier, you are not even supposed to consider the penalty at this phase. All you are looking at is guilt or innocence. And I ask that you go back in the jury room and return a verdict of guilty of capital murder because that's what he is guilty of.

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it is now time for you to retire to consider your verdict. When you go back to the jury room, the bailiffs will deliver all these exhibits to you that have been admitted into evidence. As Mr. Evans stated and I

Verdict

stated earlier, there is a form attached to these instructions for you to fill out when you have reached that verdict on each count. When you have done so, knock on the door, and the bailiff will bring you back into court to deliver that verdict. And everybody can go and deliberate this verdict except Ms. Blaylock, you are the alternate in this case, and you may stay seated for right now. Everybody else can go to the jury room.

JURY RETIRES AT 2:55 PM.

(ALL EXHIBITS IN EVIDENCE AND THE INSTRUCTIONS WERE SENT TO THE JURY ROOM. THE ALTERNATE WAS RELEASED BY THE COURT. COURT REMAINED IN RECESS UNTIL THE JURY KNOCKED AT 5:25 PM. COURT WAS THEN BROUGHT TO ORDER WITH ALL COUNSEL AND THE DEFENDANT PRESENT FOR THE FOLLOWING:)

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the bailiffs have informed me that the jury has reached a verdict in this case. Before I bring them in to render that verdict, let me make this announcement. I will not tolerate any disturbance by anybody in this courtroom. If you disturb this courtroom, I will have the Sheriff take you into custody, and I will deal with you at a later date. Do you understand that, Mr. Sheriff?

BY SHERIFF THORNBURG: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: All right.

JURY RETURNS INTO OPEN COURT AT 5:26 PM.

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, have you reached a verdict on each count?

BY JURORS: We have.

	1873
1	Verdict - Jury Polled BY THE COURT: Is it the verdict of all twelve of
2	you?
3	BY JURORS: Yes, sir.
4	BY THE COURT: Would you hand the verdict to the
5	bailiff, please.
6	(The verdict was handed to the Court and then to
7	the Clerk.)
8	BY THE COURT: The Defendant will rise. Read the
9	verdict, Ms. Halfacre, the verdicts.
10	BY THE CLERK: "We, the jury, find the Defendant
11	guilty of the Capital Murder of Bertha Tardy."
12	"We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the
13	Capital Murder of Robert Golden."
14	"We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the
15	Capital Murder of Carmen Rigby."
16	"We, the jury, find the Defendant guilty of the
17	Capital Murder of Derrick Stewart."
18	BY THE COURT: Do you want the jury polled?
19	BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.
20	BY THE COURT: Ma'am, are these your verdicts?
21	BY A JUROR: They are.
22	BY THE COURT: How about you, ma'am?
23	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
24	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
25	BY A JUROR: They are.
26	BY THE COURT: You, sir?
27	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
28	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
29	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.

	1874
1	Jury Polled
1	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
2	BY A JUROR: Yes.
3	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
4	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
5	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
6	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
7	BY THE COURT: You, sir?
8	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
9	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
10	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
11	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
12	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
13	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
14	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
15	BY THE COURT: I find that the verdict is
16	unanimous. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you
17	at this time to return to the jury room for just a
18	minute and let me discuss with the attorneys about the
19	second phase of the trial.
20	JURY LEAVES THE COURTROOM.
21	BY THE COURT: Y'all may be seated. Let me see
22	the lawyers up here.
23	(CONFERENCE AT THE BENCH OUT OF THE HEARING OF THE
24	AUDIENCE AS FOLLOWS:)
25	BY THE COURT: I don't think y'all are going to
26	object to what I'm going to say at this point in time.

It is 5:30 in the afternoon. I don't think we ought

to begin the sentencing phase until tomorrow at 9

o'clock. Everybody in agreement with that?

29

26

27

Now I'm going to expect everybody

Court recessed for the day BY MR. EVANS: 1 2 BY THE COURT: to have their witnesses here at 9 o'clock. Okay? 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Okay. All right.

Yes, sir.

END BENCH CONFERENCE

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it is 5:30 in the afternoon. There will be additional evidence that will be presented in this matter at the sentencing phase. It's too late in the day for us to do that. We are therefore going to continue that phase of the trial until in the morning -- wait just a minute now. I haven't let everybody go. Until 9 o'clock in the morning, we will begin the sentencing phase promptly at 9 o'clock. Now you are free to go. TRIAL WAS RECESSED FOR THE DAY ON FEBRUARY 11, 2004 AT 5:30 PM.

18

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2/12/04 Motion - JURY OUT

(ON FEBRUARY 12, 2004, COURT WAS OPENED, AND WITH ALL COUNSEL AND THE DEFENDANT PRESENT BUT WITH THE JURY OUT, THERE WAS THE FOLLOWING:)

BY THE COURT: Are y'all ready to proceed?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, Your Honor. The one thing we need to take care of before we proceed is whether or not anyone is going to ask for the rule to be invoked on this phase of the trial or whether all the witnesses that are testifying for both sides can be present in the courtroom.

BY MR. DE GRUY: We are not requesting the rule be invoked. We think it would be proper for them--

BY THE COURT: -- So everybody agrees they can all stay in here?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

motion to make. I think this -- I guess we can do it. The jury is not in here. Before the State begins calling witnesses, we anticipate that they will call a number of witnesses. We are not sure how many that will be testifying to what the law characterizes as victim character or victim impact evidence. And we object to the introduction of this evidence on several grounds. Under Payne v. Tennessee, the United States Supreme Court said it was admissible if relevant, and that is the due process limitation under our state and federal constitutions. And under our statute, this evidence would not be relevant to anything that the jury could consider. They can only consider in the

2/12/04 Motion - JURY OUT

weighing process of making this decision the aggravating circumstances. And none of this evidence would go to the aggravating circumstances. Therefore, it's not relevant to anything the jury is to consider and make a finding on. And of course, it is the potential for a decision based on passion and raw emotion and not the law that this Court hands down. We would like a ruling on that motion first.

BY THE COURT: Is that a motion in limine?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, it is.

BY THE COURT: Okay. That motion is overruled.

BY MR. DE GRUY: And again --

BY THE COURT: -- The law in this state is that that evidence is admissible.

BY MR. DE GRUY: And the second motion is that if -- the only way I can imagine it would be remotely relevant would be under the Victim Rights Act, and under that act it clearly, it speaks of victim in the singular. And therefore, putting on more than four witnesses, more than one representative for each of the four victims, would be beyond the scope of that legislation. So we would ask that, without waiving our objection to any of the testimony, we would ask that it be limited to one person from each family.

BY THE COURT: Okay, I don't think the law requires that I do that, and I'm not going to do that. However, I will say that under 403 at this phase, as well as the first phase, I can limit cumulative evidence. So I direct both sides not to just to

1878 Motion - JURY PRESENT accumulate evidence for the purpose of accumulating 1 Make your point and move on I guess is what I'm 2 saying. Okay. So that motion is overruled. Are we 3 ready now? 4 BY MR. EVANS: The State is ready, Your Honor. 5 BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor. 6 BY THE COURT: Okay. 7 8 JURY ENTERS THE COURTROOM. BY THE COURT: Does the State have a motion in 9 relation to--10 BY MR. EVANS: Yes, Your Honor. At this point in 11 the trial, the State would move to be allowed to 12 reintroduce all of the exhibits and testimony from the 13 14 previous phase so that the jury may consider everything that was done in the first phase in this 15 phase of the trial. 16 17 BY MR. DE GRUY: No objection, Your Honor. BY THE COURT: That motion is sustained. All 18 right, who you will you have first? 19 20 BY MR. EVANS: Roxanne Ballard. 21 BY THE WITNESS: Do I need to be sworn again? BY MR. EVANS: You have already been sworn. 22 23 BY THE COURT: You don't have to be sworn again. 24 BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, are we not going to 25 give opening statements at this phase? 26 BY THE COURT: If y'all want an opening 27 statement, I will give you one. I have never had 28 anybody request one. That's the reason I didn't go

there.

Roxanne Ballard - DIRECT

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY MR. DE GRUY: Ms. Ballard is up there. We will cover it in closing.

> BY THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. EVANS: May I proceed, Your Honor?

BY THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. EVANS: Give me just a second.

ROXANNE BALLARD,

a white female called again to testify as a witness by the State of Mississippi, this time on the SENTENCING PHASE, having been previously sworn, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:

- Ms. Ballard, you are the same Roxanne Ballard that testified in the first phase; is that correct?
 - Yes, I am. Α.
 - Ms. Bertha Tardy was your mother? Q.
 - Yes. Α.
- If you would, tell the jury just a little bit about Q. your mother.
- My mother was a very beautiful woman who was a very strong Christian woman. She was very involved in this community. She was a leader in her church. She was a leader in this community including the Economic Council, the Habitat for Humanity, the Leadership Committee, more things than I can even recall. She was very, very involved. She liked to help people, and she did everything she could to help this community and to help the people in it.
 - How did her death affect you and your family? Q.
- Well, there is no way in a couple of minutes I can Α. tell you what the last seven and a half years have been like.

Roxanne Ballard - DIRECT

But I was eight weeks away from my due date with my second child the day my mother was murdered. And it caused a lot of stress that I can't even describe. I had a four and a half year old son who was very attached to his grandmother, and we had to tell him. We had to explain to him what had happened because it was all over the news and the radio and everything. It's a very hard thing to look in the eyes of a little bitty kid and tell them something like this can happen to people. They have had to watch us go through this for all this time. And even last night asking questions of why, why this is happening to us. Why is this happening to our family? Why does my mama have to go to trial? Why did a bad person do this to four people?

I also lost Carmen, who I had known for 20 years who I was very attached to. My child Jeremy was very attached to her. He spent a lot of time in and out of the store. She baby-sat him, took care of him. It has just been a nightmare.

- Q. How long did Carmen work at the store?
- A. For 20 years.
- Q. Do you know how long Robert Golden had been working there?
 - A. It was his first day.
- Q. And do you know how long Derrick Stewart had been there?
 - A. It was his second day.
- Q. Ms. Ballard, I'm not going to be long. I just want to ask you one more question. Do you have an opinion -- you know the jury has got to determine what penalty is

1881 Ballard - DIRECT - Charles Tardy - DIRECT appropriate in this case. Do you have an opinion of what 1 sentence would be appropriate in this case? 2 I do. Yes, sir. 3 Α. Which penalty is that? 4 Ο. Death penalty. 5 Α. BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I will tender this 6 witness. 7 BY MR. DE GRUY: I have no questions. 8 BY THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Ballard. Who do 9 you have next? 10 11 BY MR. EVANS: Chuck Tardy. 12 CHARLES TARDY, a white male called to testify as a witness by the State of 13 Mississippi on the SENTENCING PHASE, testified as follows, 14 15 to-wit: BY THE COURT: State your name, please, sir. 16 17 BY THE WITNESS: Charles Holeman Tardy. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS: 18 Mr. Tardy, how were you related to Bertha Tardy? 19 Bertha was my stepmother. She and my father had 20 21 been married for a little more than a year, but I have known 22 Bertha all my life. She was a baby sitter for me when I was 23 five or six years old. She had been employed by my father in 24 the furniture business for thirty something years, so it was 25 someone I have known forever.

26 Q. What type of person was Bertha?

27

28

29

Bertha was a very loving, considerate woman. She Α. was just a great person.

What type of impact did her death have on you? Q.

Charles Tardy - DIRECT Well, it was devastating for our entire family. 1 were all saddened by the loss, and it caused grave hardship 2 for my father, and it affected my children. I had a 13 year 3 old daughter at the time who was very attached to her because 4 she had known her too all of her life, who subsequently had 5 great fears about being at home alone and had to seek 6 psychiatric counseling. So we were all affected by this. 7 BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I have no further 8 questions of this witness. 9 BY THE COURT: Wait just a minute, sir. Mr. 10 11 Tardy. Do you have any questions? BY MR. DE GRUY: No, I have no questions. 12 BY THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down. 13 Who do you have next? 14 15 BY MR. EVANS: Benny Rigby. (Mr. Tardy leaves the witness stand.) 16 BY THE COURT: Let me -- did we swear Mr. Tardy? 17 BY THE COURT REPORTER: No, sir. 18 BY THE COURT: I don't believe we did. 19 Mr. Tardy, if you will come back up here just a 20 second. Hold on, Mr. Rigby. 21 (Mr. Tardy stands before the Court.) 22 23 BY THE COURT: Would you raise your right hand, sir. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony that 24 you just gave was the truth, the whole truth, and 25 nothing but the truth so help you God? 26 BY THE WITNESS: I do. 27

28 **BY THE COURT:** All right. Does anybody have any questions concerning the fact that he didn't get sworn

Benny Rigby - DIRECT prior to--1 2 BY MR. DE GRUY: -- No, sir. No, sir. 3 BY MR. EVANS: BY THE COURT: All right, Mr. Tardy. Mr. Rigby. 4 5 BENNY RIGBY, a white male called to testify as a witness by the State of 6 Mississippi in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly 7 sworn, testified as follows, to-wit: 8 9 BY THE COURT: Have a seat. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS: 10 11 Q. State your name, please. Benny Rigby. 12 Α. 13 Q. Benny, how were you related to Carmen Rigby? Carmen was my wife for 25 and a half years. 14 Α. 15 Q. Can you tell us just a little bit about Carmen? 16 Well, everybody that knew Carmen knew that she Α. 17 loved life and she enjoyed life, and you hardly ever met her 18 that she wasn't smiling. She was a very loving wife and a 19 wonderful mother. 20 Q. How did her death that day impact on you and your 21 family? 22 Α. Well, as Roxanne said, it's hard to describe something like this to anybody else if you haven't gone 23 24 through it. At that time my eldest son Benji had just 25 finished college, and my youngest son Bryan had just finished 26 high school, and had just gotten a scholarship to play 27 baseball at Holmes Jr. College, and she was all excited about that. But anyway, she never got to see him play, and she 28

loved her children, and she was always wanting to be there

	Benny Rigby - DIRECT - Bryan Rigby - DIRECT
1	for them as I was. And a lot of things that she was cheated
2	out of like when Benji got married, she wasn't able to be
3	there. We have got a grand baby that she will never get to
4	see, and she loved children. No matter what child she was
5	around, she had to pick it up, and she just, she loved
6	children. And it's hard to know that, you know, your
7	grandchild will never get to see their grand mom.
8	Q. Benny, is there anything else that you would like
9	to add?
10	A. No, sir. Other than I thought about this a lot,
11	and I really believe that a person that does something like
12	this deserves the death penalty. They deserve to be put to
13	death.
14	BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I will tender this
15	witness.
16	BY THE COURT: Any questions?
17	BY MR. DE GRUY: No questions, Your Honor.
18	BY THE COURT: You may step down, Mr. Rigby.
19	WITNESS EXCUSED.
20	BY MR. EVANS: Bryan Rigby next, Your Honor.
21	BRYAN RIGBY,

a white male called to testify as a witness by the State of Mississippi in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:

- State your name, please. Q.
- Α. Bryan Rigby.
- Bryan, Carmen was your mother; is that right? Q.
- Yes, sir. Α.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Bryan Rigby - DIRECT

- Q. How old were you when she was killed?
- A. I was 18.
- Q. Can you tell us just a little bit about your relationship with your mother?
- A. Well, being the youngest child, we were very close. And by being the youngest, I got a little special treatment because I was her baby. But she, it was mine and my brother and my dad's beck and call and did everything that she could ever do for us to be sure that we had the best. And basically, just I mean there was no doubt in our mind that she loved us and knew that -- we knew that and just a great person to be around, I mean just unbelievable person. As my dad said, she loved children and loved us. And as my dad was saying, I was 18 and just graduated high school and going to college and about to go to college. I had just signed a baseball scholarship and everything, and I thought my little world was perfect. But without her, there is nothing.
- Q. Bryan, is there anything else you would like to add?
- A. Just that, I mean could I tell you how this has affected mine and my family's life, and I mean just the little things, the things that are supposed to be exciting. Going to college and when you are leaving and going to college, it is supposed to be exciting, and when you leave and go to college, you feel like you are abandoning your family, and it shouldn't be that way.

BoBo and I were very close. And I'm the one that got him the job. And I think about that every day. And just like they say, that this man destroyed four families' lives.

а

1	Bryan Rigby - DIRECT - Jimmy Latham - DIRECT And there is nothing anybody can say and nothing anybody can
2	do to replace that. His family still gets to see him. He
3	gets to breathe. He has a thought process, and he took that
4	away from four people.
5	BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, we tender this
6	witness.
7	BY MR. DE GRUY: We have no questions, Your
8	Honor.
9	BY THE COURT: You may step down, Mr. Rigby.
10	WITNESS EXCUSED.
11	BY MR. EVANS: Reverend Jimmy Latham.
12	BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, could the bailiff
13	pass the I think some of the jurors may need
14	tissue.
15	BY THE COURT: Sure.
16	JIMMY LATHAM,
17	a white male called to testify as a witness by the State of
18	Mississippi in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly
19	sworn, testified as follows, to-wit:
20	BY THE COURT: State your name, please, sir.
21	BY THE WITNESS: Jimmy Latham.
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:
23	Q. Reverend Latham, I want to ask you if you knew
24	Carmen Rigby during her life? Did you know Carmen Rigby?
25	A. I did.
26	Q. Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury a
27	little bit about what Carmen was like?
28	A. I was called to be Carmen's pastor in 1988 in

October. And of course, I had known her prior to that, but

Jimmy Latham - DIRECT in the church family, you get to know them real well. Carmen 1 2 was a lady of the first order. I mean in regards to her love for her family, her church and her pastor, she was top. 3 4 served the church very faithfully. She was our nursery 5 mother, and I don't care how many children that came into the church, she would care for them. She didn't wait -- excuse 6 me. She didn't have to wait for somebody to tell her to go 7 8 to see about the children. She would get them and carry them to the nursery and tend to them. And like the previous 9 10 testimony, she loves children. And it was, in all the times 11 that we were there -- of course, she was treasurer at the 12 time of her death and very efficient. But her love for people was radiated through her daily, constantly, to not 13 just the church family, but to people in the community. She 14 15 had a compassion for them, and I just -- for a lady, she 16 would, it would be one that you could very, you could say 17 well, thank God for giving me a lady, a woman, a spouse, a 18 wife, a mother like Carmen Rigby.

Q. What type of impact did her death have on this community?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. Oh, it devastated our church. It was, it seemed like it made an indelible mark on the church body, and it never was the same after that. It never was the same after her death.
- Q. Reverend Latham, is there anything else you would like to add?
- A. I would like to say one thing. As much as she loved children, I regret and I'm sorry that she never got to hold and love her little granddaughter.

1888 - Willie Golden - DIRECT Jimmy Latham - CROSS Tender the witness, Your Honor. 1 BY MR. EVANS: 2 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DE GRUY: Reverend Latham, I know, I imagine you have 3 Q. counseled the family a great deal over the years and been a 4 comfort to them. Would you agree to that? 5 I have tried. 6 And I know you are trying to help them move on 7 Ο. because that is what those of you who are left behind have to 8 9 do, all of us. Correct? (No audible response.) 10 Α. And I would just ask you if you agree with me, that 11 Ο. it is time that we begin some healing? 12 Is it -- I can't--13 Α. 14 -- Is it time that we begin some healing? Q. 15 Α. Oh, definitely. 16 BY MR. DE GRUY: That's all I have, Your Honor. 17 BY THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Evans? 18 BY MR. EVANS: No, sir. 19 BY THE COURT: Reverend, you may step down. 20 WITNESS EXCUSED. 21 BY THE COURT: Who do you have next? 22 BY MR. EVANS: Willie Golden. 23 WILLIE GOLDEN, 24 a black male called to testify as a witness by the State of 25 Mississippi in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn, testified as follows, to-wit: 26 27 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:

State your name, please.

Willie Golden.

28

29

Q.

Α.

Willie Golden - DIRECT

- Q. Mr. Golden, how were you related to Robert?
- A. Robert Golden was my brother.
- Q. Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury a little bit about Robert?
- A. Well, Robert was the third one in the family, and he graduated from high school at Winona High School and went on to college. And he accepted a job and later got married, and he had two children in life. He worked hard to try to support those two children because they were very sickly. And he just struggled in life, and he was just a kind person and did a lot of -- he was just faithful to his family.
 - Q. You say he had how many children?
 - A. He had two. Two sons.
 - Q. How old were they at the time he was killed?
- A. One was about 17, and the other one probably was about eight.
 - Q. Mr. Golden, were you close to your brother?
- A. Well, he and I was close because we grew up together. The rest of my family members grew up and they left and went to different places, but he and I was always close. We lived all our lives here in Winona together. So we always saw each other at least once or twice a week, so we was close.
- Q. How has his death, being murdered affected you and your family and his family?
- A. Well, it affected me a great deal because like I say, we was close. And at the time, along about the time that happened, a little after that happened, I had went through a divorce before then, and he always came by and

Willie Golden - DIRECT You know, when he get off work at night, he checked on me. would come by, sometime wouldn't even come in. He would just come by the window and asked me was I all right. And that just meant so much to me at that particular time, and he just meant a great deal to me because like I say, we was close. He and I was close, and we just always seen each other. And 6 the last day before this happened, he came by, and we sit and 7 talked, and not knowing that was the last time that we would talk. So he meant a great deal to me as a brother. just a brother and a friend, just you know, just all those 10 things to me because we was close. 11

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

- Do you know how his death affected his children?
- Well, his death affected the children, especially Α. his young son because he had a lot of problems. You know, he is kind of handicapped like, and I know it had a lot of effect on him, you know, and his wife because she is just kind of in a mentally stage back and forth to the doctor. So it had a great deal, you know, it just really put a burden on his family.
- Mr. Golden, is there anything else you would like Q. to add?
- Well, the main thing, I hate to pass judgment on Α. anybody, but I just want the right thing to be done and just to be over.

Tender the witness, Your Honor. BY MR. EVANS: BY THE COURT: Wait just a second, Mr. Golden. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DE GRUY:

Q. Mr. Golden, I'm sorry; I just have one question. Whatever the jury decides, you are comfortable with; that's

1891 Willie Golden - CROSS - Dale Stewart - DIRECT the right thing? 1 If this jury decides. 2 Α. I just wanted to understand what you were saying? 3 Α. Yes. 4 BY MR. DE GRUY: Thank you. 5 BY THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Evans? 6 BY MR. EVANS: No, sir. 7 BY THE COURT: Mr. Golden, you may step down. 8 WITNESS EXCUSED. 9 BY THE COURT: Who will you have next? 10 BY MR. EVANS: Dale Stewart. 11 DALE STEWART, 12 a white male called to testify as a witness by the State of 13 Mississippi in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly 14 sworn, testified, as follows, to-wit: 15 BY THE COURT: State your name, please, sir. 16 BY THE WITNESS: Dale Stewart. 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS: 18 19 Ο. Dale, how were you related to BoBo? He was my younger brother. He was six years 20 21 younger than me. How old was BoBo when he was killed? 22 Ο. Sixteen. About three weeks after his sixteenth 23 24 birthday just happened.

younger brother was like? 29 Yes, sir. He was very outgoing, well liked by most Α.

Can you tell us just a little bit about what your

And how old were you at that time?

25

26

27

28

Q.

Α.

Q.

Twenty-two.

Dale Stewart - DIRECT everybody. According to when this happened, the funeral was held at First Baptist Church that day, and the church was full, and he was 16 years old. So I believe he was well liked and respected by many.

- Q. How close were you and your brother?
 - A. Very close.
 - Q. What, can you describe what kind of impact his being murdered had on you and your family?
 - A. Well, he was deprived of a lot. He never got, never had a prom, didn't graduate high school. We were taken away; Christmases were taken away, birthdays. He was, he was a very good athlete. The night before, the night before he was shot, he pitched a seven to nothing shut out in an all star baseball game. As far as the impact on the community, going by the grave site, and one year after this happened, they named a baseball field after him. (NOTE: Witness is crying.) I'm sorry.
 - Q. It's okay.
 - A. But my mother and father, to see them hurt -- I don't know what it's like to lose a child or a mother or a father. But I guarantee it hurts as bad to lose a sibling and a best friend.
 - Q. Dale, is there anything else you would like to add?
 - A. I would. BoBo lived for a week in the intensive care unit in Jackson, Mississippi. He was brain dead. He never responded. He was hooked up to machines and everything, and in our situation we did, other than the other three families, we did have an opportunity to say goodbye, whether he was responsive or not. We had time to spend with

Dale Stewart - DIRECT - Kathy Perminter - DIRECT him. And I just want people that do remember BoBo to remember what he was like before any of this happened.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I tender this witness.

BY MR. DE GRUY: We have no questions.

BY THE COURT: You may step down.

WITNESS EXCUSED

BY MR. EVANS: Kathy Perminter will be the next witness, Your Honor.

KATHY PERMINTER,

a white female called to testify as a witness by the State of Mississippi in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn, testified as follows, to-wit:

BY THE COURT: State your name, please.

BY THE WITNESS: Kathy Perminter.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. Kathy, how were you related to BoBo?
- A. I was BoBo's mother.
- Q. Can you tell us just a little bit about BoBo and your family?
- A. Yes, sir. I could tell you a lot, but to make it short, BoBo was the youngest of my two children. He was my baby. There is six years difference between Dale and BoBo. And from the time he -- I don't know; Dale, he was six years old at the time, so I was just more strong to BoBo at that time. But as he grew older and all, BoBo had a dream. He had a big dream of life. He was in the second grade. He told me one night; he said, "Mama," he said, "I would love to just go get a GED and go to work somewhere. I just want to make money and just not go to school and just make money; go

Kathy Perminter - DIRECT get a job and make money." Well, the night before all this happened, he called me excited about his job at Tardy Furniture Company. He said, "Mama, I'm really going to like this job." He said, "It's cool inside." He said, "All I done was sweep the floors and, you know, just do what they told me, dust." And before that, he had been out in the hot sun painting fences, and he didn't like it. And I think Carmen was the one that got him the job. BoBo loved baseball. And that was the dream that he wanted to fulfill. He had told me prior, when he first started playing baseball, he said, "Mama, I want to play for the pros one day," and he was so good. Everyone that new Bo, they loved him. loved him when they first met him. He always had a smile, never had an enemy that I know of; never crossed paths with anyone.

The impact as far as my family, it's hard. It's hard to go to Christmas. It's a part of you missing. It's a part of my family missing. When this all happened, it was like one side of me is gone, and it will never come back. And I'm ready for some peace. I have a peace knowing that Bo is in heaven, but he is an angel in heaven. (NOTE: Witness is crying.) But I want to be able to put all this to a closure and not have to go through this any more.

Bo didn't graduate from school. He didn't have that opportunity to walk down the aisle and get his diploma. My mom, she has a wall in her house at that time of all of her grandchildren when they graduated, their senior portraits. Bo's was the next one up. He was in a beauty pageant. After all this happened, I had a photographer to

Kathy Perminter - DIRECT - Raleigh Wood - DIRECT take just from his shoulders up to get a senior portrait so I could fill that place because I couldn't stand it being vacant. But I'm just ready for the peace. BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I will tender this witness. BY MR. DE GRUY: No questions. BY THE COURT: You may step down. WITNESS EXCUSED.

BY MR. EVANS: Raleigh Woods, Your Honor.

RALEIGH WOOD,

a white male called to testify as a witness by the State of Mississippi on the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn, testified as follows, to-wit:

BY THE COURT: State your name. Go ahead.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. Would you state your name?
- A. Raleigh Wood.

- Q. Mr. Woods, how did you know BoBo Stewart?
- A. At that time I was head baseball coach at Winona High School, and BoBo was one of my players. And he was, he was a super guy. He was always, always happy, always had a smile on his face. Everybody loved BoBo. He was my leading hitter as a sophomore. I think he batted like .427, and he was, he was a super athlete. And BoBo would have gone on, and he would have played college baseball. He had that type of ability where he would have gone on and played, and that ability was-- he never had that chance. It was taken from him. But he was a super, super young man. I watched him play the night before. He would, he came up to me right

Raleigh Wood - DIRECT after the ball game, and he said, "Coach, did you see me?" said, "You looked great out there." He just pitched a great ball game. He was going to be doing a lot of pitching for me the next year. He said, "Are you coming back tomorrow night?" I said, "I'm going to be back again tomorrow night to watch you again." And he was just that kind of a person -- yes, sir; no, sir. He would come out of his way to see you and talk to you and just check on you, see how you are doing. He would play with my little girl. He loved kids. But he was a great person.

- Q. What type of impact did his death have on this community?
- A. It affected the entire high school. You know, the kids, all the kids over there, the entire baseball team. You know, it just affected all of them. BoBo was the kind that would, you know, get to practice, and he would cheer everybody up. And he always had that smile on his face. You know, if somebody was having a bad day, he would try to, he would cheer them up, get them going. And he wasn't there after that, you know, and it just wasn't the same because nobody was really there to take that role, you know, that BoBo had done. He was the one that picked people up, and everybody, you know, looked to, for him in that role, and that's what he did. He was a super young man.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I will tender this witness.

BY MR. DE GRUY: No questions.

BY THE COURT: You may step down.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

	1897
1	Archie Flowers - DIRECT BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, the State of
2	Mississippi rests.
3	STATE OF MISSISSIPPI RESTS ON SENTENCING PHASE.
4	BY THE COURT: Who will you have first?
5	BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, we call Archie
6	Flowers.
7	ARCHIE FLOWERS,
8	a black male called to testify as a witness by the Defendant
9	in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn,
10	testified as follows, to-wit:
11	BY MR. DE GRUY: May I proceed?
12	BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DE GRUY:
14	Q. Would you please state your name.
15	A. Archie Lee Flowers.
16	Q. Mr. Flowers, where do you live?
17	A. In Winona.
18	Q. And how long have you lived there?
19	A. Probably about forty something years.
20	Q. Are you working now?
21	A. Right. Working at Wal-Mart.
22	Q. How long have you worked at Wal-Mart?
23	A. Three years.
24	Q. And what is your relationship to Curtis Flowers?
25	A. We real close.
26	Q. And you are his father?
27	A. Right.
28	Q. You said you are real close. Were there things as

Curtis was growing up that y'all did together?

Archie Flowers - DIRECT

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- A. We sung together. You know, I got a group, and he sang in my group.
 - Q. And what kind of group is that?
 - A. Gospel group.
 - Q. How long have you been involved with the gospel group?
 - A. I think about thirty something years.
 - Q. What type of places do y'all sing?
 - A. All around the country, up north.
 - Q. Do you do public concerts or--
 - A. No -- sometimes and benefit programs.
 - Q. Benefit programs?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. Is this a paying job for you? Are you a professional musician?
 - A. No.
 - Q. And you said that Curtis sang with you?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. How long was he part of your group? What age was he when he joined your group?
 - A. I guess he was about 12 or 13, something like that.
 - Q. So I assume it wasn't a paying job for him?
 - A. No, it wasn't paid.
 - Q. Was there a lot of work involved in being part of a gospel group, a traveling gospel group?
 - A. It is when, you know, you are traveling. You have got to see to getting your uniforms, stuff like that.
 - Q. What kind of singer is Curtis?
 - A. He is a real good singer.

Archie Flowers - DIRECT

- Q. Do you have other children?
- A. Sho' do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Q. Could you tell us who they are?
- A. One of them -- my oldest son Archie, and my oldest girl Felicia, and my next girl is Priscilla, and the next girl is Shareta.
 - Q. It's six children?
 - A. Six.
 - Q. I won't ask you their ages.
 - A. I probably couldn't remember.
 - Q. Were your children close as they were growing up?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. What kind of relationship did Curtis have with them?
- A. They always was cracking jokes, playing. But Curtis, he, every time we go rehearse, he always crack a joke before we start rehearsing. So I tell him, I said, "Now we are fixing to get serious."
 - Q. Would he get serious?
 - A. He would get serious then.
- Q. Do you give your kids chores to do around the house?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And how was Curtis?
- A. He did it; he did it all. You didn't have to actually tell him. He know what he had to do. He would do it.
- Q. Did he, what kind of relationship did he have to the neighbors?

Archie Flowers - DIRECT

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

20

21

22

23

- A. Oh, he was good to neighbors. Any of the neighbors around there could tell you. He always trying to help somebody.
 - Q. What type of things would he do?
- A. He would go across the street. He would rake leaves for a lady, and he shaved an old man across the street, you know. He was just always involved in stuff like that.
 - Q. Do you have a close family, Mr. Flowers?
 - A. Real close.
- Q. And what about your wife, Mr. Flowers? Is that Curtis' mother?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. How long have you been married?
 - A. Forty years.
 - Q. Is she in the courtroom today?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Are you here today to speak for her?
- 19 A. Yes.
 - Q. I know yesterday was enough to-- a difficult night for her last night. Did she ask you to be her spokesperson today?
 - A. Right.
 - BY MR. DE GRUY: That's all I have, Your Honor.
- 25 BY MR. EVANS: No questions.
- 26 BY THE COURT: You may step down, sir.
- 27 WITNESS EXCUSED.
- 28 BY MR. DE GRUY: Call Nelson Forrest.
- 29 BY THE COURT: Nelson Forrest. Wait a minute.

Nelson Forrest - DIRECT Holly, what are you doing? 1 2 BY THE BAILIFF: I was going to turn the air conditioner fan on. 3 BY THE COURT: Okay, well, let's just stay down 4 here for right now. 5 Thermostat was in the back of the jury 6 7 box.) NELSON FORREST, 8 9 a black male called to testify as a witness by the Defendant in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn, 1.0 11 testified as follows, to-wit: 12 BY THE COURT: Have a seat up here. 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DE GRUY: Mr. Forrest, could you please tell us your name. 14 Q. 15 Nelson Forrest. Α. Mr. Forrest, where do you live? 16 Q. 116 Hazel Circle, here in Winona. 17 Α. How long have you lived in Winona? 18 Q. All my life. 19 Α. 20 Q. Are you currently employed? 21 Yes. Α. 22 And could you tell us what you are doing? Q. 23 Α. I am employed with the Mississippi Military 24 Department, Camp McCain. I am also Supervisor District Five 25 here in Montgomery County. I'm a pastor of the United 26 Methodist Church in Wespin in Oktibbeha County. And I'm a 27 member of the Mississippi National Guard here in Winona, the 28 1st and 114th field artillery.

And you know Curtis Flowers?

29

Ο.

Nelson Forrest - DIRECT

A. Yes.

- Q. And are you related to Curtis Flowers?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. How are you related to him?
 - A. His father and my father are first cousins.
 - Q. Were you close to Curtis when he was growing up?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Tell me a little bit about that relationship. How often you would see him?
- A. Well, we had a good relationship. We were making, I guess we had a bond there. We would see each other at least once a week or more. He would either come by my house, or I would meet him somewhere in the street or down at my mother-in-law's. She stayed right across round the corner from him, but we made contact at least once a week.
- Q. And what type of things did y'all do on these meetings?
- A. Well, we just talked about different things. A lot of times if he had a new song that he would want to try to sing, he would talk to me about it, and he was a little shy at first starting off. And for some reason, he thought I was the best singer in the world. And I would encourage him just, you know; nervous is all right. That is just part of life.
 - Q. Like a mentor to him?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now you told us you were a singer. Do you sing in a group as well?
 - A. Yes. I am a member of the Forrest Brothers gospel

1903 Nelson Forrest - DIRECT singing group here from Winona. 1 Have you ever sung with Curtis? 2 Yeah, we have been on programs with him a lot of Α. 3 times. 4 Now he was in another group? 5 Q. Right. 6 Α. But y'all would sing together. Did Curtis attend 7 Q. church with you? 8 9 Α. Yes. What was it like? What was Curtis like when he was 10 Q. 11 around you? Well, he was happy around me. He's still happy. 12 He had a little shyness, but, you know, he was getting over 13 that. But it was a lot of fun. We laughed and talked, and 14 15 he would tell me things he had been involved in, and we shared our deal. 16 17 Do you still communicate with Curtis? Q. Well, mostly communications I have with Curtis is 18 Α. 19 through his mother and father. He just send me word that not 20 to worry about him; he all right, and to keep praying for That's the way we handle it. 21 BY MR. DE GRUY: That's all I have, Your Honor. 22 23 BY MR. EVANS: No questions. 24

BY THE COURT: You may step down, sir.

WITNESS EXCUSED.

25

26

27

28

29

BY MR. DE GRUY: Tarryon Daniels.

TARRYON DANIELS,

a black male called to testify as a witness by the Defendant in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn,

1904 Tarryon Daniels - DIRECT testified as follows, to-wit: 1 State your name, please. 2 BY THE COURT: BY THE WITNESS: Tarryon Daniels. 3 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DE GRUY: Mr. Daniels, where do you live? 5 Q. Here in Winona, 32 Powell Street. 6 Α. How long have you lived here? 7 Ο. All my life. 8 Α. 9 Q. And how old are you? Thirty-three. 10 Α. 11 Q. And are you working now? Uh-huh. Right now I'm employed in Greenwood at 12 Α. John Richard. 13 Q. How long have you been working there? 14 15 Α. Seven and a half years. 16 And you know Curtis Flowers? Q. I do. 17 Α. How long have you known Curtis? 18 Q. 19 Α. All our life, all my life. 20 Q. Y'all grew up together? We did. 21 Α. 22 Did y'all play sports together? Q. 23 Α. Yeah, we played basketball together. We went 24 fishing together, sung together. 25 Q. Did y'all ever work together? 26 Α. Yeah, we worked at Richardson Brothers south across from Wal-Mart here in Winona. 27

Q. How long did y'all work together?

29

A. I'm thinking three and a half, maybe four years.

Tarryon Daniels - DIRECT

- O. What kind of worker was Curtis?
- A. Curtis was a good worker. We had no complaints. Everything you asked him to do, he would do it.
- Q. Now you mentioned fish; you used to fish with him and sing with him?
 - A. Uh-hum.
 - Q. Are you in, were you in a singing group with him?
 - A. I was.
 - Q. Could you tell me about that group?
- A. It's a nice group. Like Archie said, we traveled all over the world. I never did get a chance to make the trips up north with them, but I sung here locally. And Curtis was a good singer. He always made everybody happy when he sung. When him and his father had a song together, they sung and just touched on everybody.
 - Q. Are you still singing?
- A. No, I'm not. I haven't sung since Curtis got locked up.
 - Q. How come you are not singing?
 - A. Um, just don't seem right without Curtis.
 - BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I object. That is not proper. There is specific case law that says impact on defense witnesses is not proper.
 - BY THE COURT: That is a correct statement of the law.
 - BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, I can't ask him why he quit singing? I think it goes directly to--
 - BY THE COURT: -- Why would that be relevant as to why he quit singing?

1906 Tarryon Daniels - DIRECT BY MR. DE GRUY: Because if he were allowed to 1 answer, it would show a character trait of Mr. 2 Flowers. 3 BY MR. EVANS: No, sir. He is entitled to ask 4 about the Defendant, but according to Wilcher, Turner, 5 Jordan and a long line of cases, he is not allowed to 6 ask about any impact on defense witnesses. 7 BY MR. DE GRUY: I'm not asking about an impact 8 9 of anything this jury might do on him. BY MR. EVANS: No, sir. 10 BY MR. DE GRUY: I'm asking about why he is no 11 longer singing, and it's directly related to their 12 relationship as co-members of the singing group, not 13 on anything--14 BY THE COURT: I will allow it. 15 BY THE WITNESS: 16 I haven't sung in the group since Curtis left 17 because me and him used to ride together to most of the 18 19 programs, and it just, I just don't feel like I could do it 20 without him. Thank you, Tarryon. 21 Q. BY MR. DE GRUY: That's all I have. 22 23 BY MR. EVANS: No questions. 24 BY THE COURT: You may step down. 25 WITNESS EXCUSED. BY MR. DE GRUY: Kittery Jones. 26 27 KITTERY JONES, a black male called to testify as a witness by the Defendant 28

on the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn,

Kittery Jones - DIRECT
testified as follows, to-wit:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

23

24

25

26

27

BY THE COURT: Have a seat. State your name.

BY THE WITNESS: Kittery Jones.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DE GRUY:

- Q. Mr. Jones, where do you live?
- A. Here in Winona.
- Q. And how long have you lived here?
- A. All my life.
- Q. Are you working now?
- A. Yes, sir. I own my own business, heating and air conditioning and refrigeration.
 - Q. Do you do any other work?
 - A. Yes, sir. I preach the gospel of Jesus Christ.
 - Q. And where are you a preacher?
 - A. Right here in Winona.
- Q. Are you related to Curtis Flowers?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. What, how are you related?
- 19 A. He is my cousin.
- Q. Are you close to Curtis? Are y'all close?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. How would you characterize that relationship?
 - A. Well, when we was growing up, I spent majority of my time at their house. I stayed at his house just as much as I stayed at mine. We grew up together. We laughed; we played; we cried together. We just like brothers.
 - Q. Did y'all ever sing together?
- A. No, sir. I can't sing. But I would ride with them, like if he would ask me. He would call me Spud. He

Jones - DIRECT - James Aiken - DIRECT said, "Spud, you going to come to practice with us?" And I 1 tell him yeah, even though I didn't want to go, but I would 2 go. And we would ride on the back of the bus, and we would 3 just play all the way there and laugh and crack jokes. 4 BY MR. DE GRUY: That's all I have, Your Honor. 5 BY MR. EVANS: No questions. 6 BY THE COURT: You may step down. 7 WITNESS EXCUSED. 8 9 BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, may I check on one. (Mr. de Gruy confers with Ms. Ferraro.) 10 BY MR. DE GRUY: Very quickly, Your Honor. Your 11 Honor, we call Jim Aiken. 12 JAMES EVANS AIKEN, 13 a black male called to testify as a witness by the Defendant 14 15 in the SENTENCING PHASE, having first been duly sworn, testified as follows, to-wit: 16 17 BY THE COURT: All right, have a seat right 18 there. 19 BY THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir. 20 BY THE COURT: State your name, please, sir. 21 BY THE WITNESS: My name is James Evans Aiken. AIKEN. 22 23 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DE GRUY: 24 Thank you, Mr. Aiken. Mr. Aiken, what is your Q. 25 current employment? 26 I am president of James E. Aiken and Associates Α. Incorporated. 27 28 Q. And what does that company do?

It is a correctional consulting firm.

29

Α.

James Aiken - DIRECT

Q. And could you share with us your educational background?

- A. I was educated in elementary as well as high schools in Camden, South Carolina. I attended Benedict College in Columbia, South Carolina, to which I received a degree, a Bachelor of Arts degree. And I have also received a Master's degree in criminal justice from the University of South Carolina that is in Columbia, South Carolina.
 - Q. And what is your background in corrections?
- A. I started in corrections in 1971 in the capacity of a social worker in the substance abuse program at a medium security prison in South Carolina. This medium security prison housed younger male inmates in a medium security environment; that is, they were behind fences and gun towers and security systems. However, they had opportunity to move throughout the facility under supervision. From there I was promoted to deputy warden of that same facility in South Carolina. I am sorry; I was administrative assistant, then deputy warden at that facility.

From there, I became deputy warden at the state penitentiary in South Carolina. The state penitentiary, which is also located in Columbia, housed the most dangerous preditorial, disruptive, violent inmates, inmates that not only inflicted violence in the community, but also inflicted violence upon other inmates as well as the staff. This facility is a maximum, super maximum security compound. It also housed death row. It also housed inmate population that were waiting adjudication for psychiatric evaluation. It was about 1800 to 2000 inmates.

James Aiken - DIRECT

From there, I became the warden of the women's prison, and this was also in Columbia, South Carolina. And this housed maximum security female population as well as medium and minimum security inmate population. From there, I became deputy -- I'm sorry, from there I became warden of the state penitentiary in South Carolina. And I just explained to you the background of that facility and the mission of that facility.

Also, while in the capacity of warden of that facility, I was called upon to perform executions on inmates. I have executed two inmates personally as well as managed the death row population, as well as disruptive inmate population--

BY MR. EVANS: -- Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Wait just a minute.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I would -- and I was going to go ahead and wait until later, but I would object to any testimony that this witness has. We have been furnished information that he is expected to testify as to future dangerousness and adaptability to prison life. The cases are very clear-- Hansen, Skipper v. South Carolina, Jordan v. State. This is not proper or relevant testimony for this jury to hear, and we would object to this witness testifying about any of the information that we have been furnished that they expect him to testify to related to that.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, it is absolutely relevant, and I suggest that the District Attorney

James Aiken - DIRECT
read Skipper
the Court said
mitigation.

BY THE CO
Wilcher?

BY MR. DO
BY THE CO
BY T

read <u>Skipper v. South Carolina</u>. It is precisely what the Court said must be presented in the way of mitigation.

BY THE COURT: Well, how does it get around Wilcher?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Two things--

BY THE COURT: Where they were trying to show photographs of Parchman and death row, maximum security, testimony of prior prison officials.

Wilcher held such evidence has no relation to the Defendant's character, his record, or the circumstances of the crime.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, we are exactly going to get to this man's character and his adaptability to prison. And it is absolutely proper, and that is what Skipper holds. And we are not talking about trying to show pictures of Parchman. We are trying to explain to this jury based on Mr. Aiken's evaluation of Mr. Flowers.

BY THE COURT: Has he made a personal evaluation of him?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, he has, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's get it to that point, and then Mr. Evans, you may make another objection. But right now, this has got nothing to do with this because he has not stated his relationship to Mr. Flowers. So you have got to make it specific to get--

BY MR. DE GRUY: -- We have to lay our foundation

James Aiken - DIRECT for his ability to make this evaluation, Your Honor, 1 and that's what we were attempting to do. 2 BY MR. EVANS: Which so far, we are objecting to 3 that because they have not done that. 4 BY MR. DE GRUY: And we haven't tendered him yet. 5 If we could have a little patience from the District 6 Attorney. 7 BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I object to that in 8 the record. That is not proper. 9 BY THE COURT: Well, you need to go ahead--10 BY MR. DE GRUY: -- He is objecting to a witness 11 not being tendered prior to his being tendered, and he 12 is objecting to us laying the foundation. You can't 13 14 object to us not having laid the foundation --15

BY THE COURT: -- Are you going to tender him as an expert?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Okay. Well, go ahead.

BY MR. DE GRUY:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- I am sorry, Mr. Aiken. If you can recall where you were in sharing your background with us?
- Yes. I was warden of the state penitentiary in Α. South Carolina which housed, as I was stating, death row population as well as the most violent inmate population in the State of South Carolina. From there, I became deputy regional administrator, which I supervised 16 various prisons within the South Carolina Department of Corrections to include women's prisons, males' prisons, maximum, super maximum, all the way down to minimum security facilities.

James Aiken - DIRECT

From there, I became Commissioner of Corrections or Director of Corrections for the State of Indiana at which time I had under my control as the chief executive officer over 46, 47 facilities. And that ranged from juvenile facilities, male facilities, adult facilities, female facilities, as well as parole services and community corrections.

And I might go back a little bit. Back in 1986, I was asked by the United States Justice Department to begin providing technical assistance and expert consultation to other jurisdictions. And that included me in being involved in teaching wardens how to be wardens of prisons, teaching wardens how to be wardens of super maximum security prisons, teaching leadership development, development of classification systems within prison systems as well as jail systems, hostage negotiations, critical event; that is, hostage situations, riots, et cetera, how to prevent them. Also, I was involved in providing this technical assistance to just about every jurisdiction in the United States to include Alaska as well as Hawaii, and the State of Mississippi.

I have also, I might add that my experience involved the classification of inmate population. And what I mean by that, putting them in the proper management, proper security, proper programming to insure the safety and well being of staff, other inmates, as well as the general community. And I have done this thousands and thousands of times personally as well as to devise as well as to evaluate other systems.

James Aiken - DIRECT

Getting back to my career, also when I left
Indiana, I became Director or Commissioner of the Department
of Corrections for the United States Virgin Islands which
gave me an opportunity to not only look at prisons on a
national level, but also an international level.

And as I stated at the beginning, I am president of James E. Aiken and Associates, and I have provided technical assistance, expert assistance in relationship to managing prisons, not only in the United States but also in Costa Rica, Puerto Rico, of course, in the Virgin Islands, Canada, and the Dutch Kingdom.

- Q. Okay. Have you ever made assessments of classifications in corrections practices here in Mississippi?
- A. Yes. I have provided technical assistance to the State of Mississippi on site as well as at the National Academy of Corrections as well as other off-sites in relationship to not only classification of inmate population, but managing prison security systems.
- Q. In your 30 plus years in corrections, have you ever been qualified as an expert in corrections in classification of inmates?
 - A. Yes, I have, sir.
 - Q. Can you tell us how many times?
 - A. Oh, I would say 30 to 40 times, 35 or 40.
- Q. And what jurisdictions have you been accepted as an expert in?
- A. I have been accepted as an expert in judicial proceedings in the State of Florida, the State of Georgia, the State of South Carolina, the State of North Carolina, the

James Aiken - DIRECT
State of Virginia, the State of Alabama, the State of
Mississippi, the State of Missouri, the State of Louisiana,
the State of Florida--I mean Arizona, United States District
Court of Connecticut, United States District Court of
District of Columbia, United States District Court of
Georgia, United States District Court of Alabama.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, at this time we tender Mr. Aiken as an expert in classification of inmates and correction procedures.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, the State would renew its objection. This expertise, even if he be an expert, has nothing to do with this particular hearing. The cases are very clear. Only an expert that has been accepted as an expert in the field of future behavior is qualified to testify. And as this Court is familiar in Eskridge v. State, which this Court tried, in that particular case there was even a psychologist that the Supreme Court said could not testify in that particular case because he was not even an expert in the field of future behavior. Any expertise in prison classification is irrelevant to what we are here on today, and I would again object.

BY MR. DE GRUY: I have one question.

BY MR. DE GRUY:

- Q. Mr. Aiken, is part of making a classification decision, does it involve making a decision on future dangerousness of an inmate?
 - A. Yes.

BY MR. DE GRUY: We would again tender Mr. Aiken

James Aiken - DIRECT

as an expert. And the <u>Eskridge</u> case, Your Honor, I am sure both you and Mr. Evans are more familiar with it. But in that case the psychologist had never evaluated Mr. Eskridge and could give nothing, no -- nor his records, and the problem was, is that in <u>Eskridge</u> they were trying to talk about generalities. We are not talking about generalities or what it would be like in prison. We are talking about Mr. Flowers and how, how he has conducted himself in prison.

BY THE COURT: At this point in his testimony, I will accept him as an expert in the field of prison classification. As to his expertise in future behavior, I think you need to establish that a little bit further than what you have done, and I think he needs to be tendered--

BY MR. EVANS: --And I would like to voir dire him, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Okay, well, I'm going to let him -- I'm going to let you finish first, okay.

BY MR. DE GRUY:

- Q. Mr. Aiken, in determining classification, making classification decisions, and you have testified that you develop plans and assist states like Mississippi in improving plans for the classification of inmates. Is a part of that, a subgroup of that expertise, does it require the assessment of future dangerousness?
- A. That is correct. What you do is assess the individual's history, age, as well as a number of other factors, and you determine what is the information that is

James Aiken - DIRECT gathered in relationship to how this person is going to behave from here on in this type of prison environment, and what type of management, what type of security, what type of program addict interventions that you need in order to prevent future dangerousness or to control future dangerousness as well as to anticipate the probability of what type of future dangerousness this individual represents

- Q. And as a warden and a classification supervisor, that person has the responsibility of protecting their employees as well as the public and other inmates; is that correct?
- A. That is correct. Classification is looking into the future. The classification is looking at a set of information and data, making the determination on that information and data in relationship to what this individual is capable of doing in the future while in this environment.
- Q. So when you say this environment, you are talking about institutionalized?
 - A. That is correct.

while in the correctional setting.

- Q. So is it fair to say that if you, that the determination of the future dangerousness of an inmate is critical to the classification process?
- A. It's essential as well as critical. It is the foundation for people managing prisons. It is the backbone, looking at previous behavior or lack thereof and making a determination in relationship to future behavior.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, I believe Mr. Evans has some questions.

James Aiken - Voir Dire

BY THE COURT: Mr. Evans.

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. Mr. Aiken, just a few questions. What type of educational background do you have in either the field of psychology or psychiatry?
- A. I have taken courses in my undergraduate studies that had relationship to human behavior as well as received training obviously within the Department of Corrections that I have worked in, in relationship to future dangerousness as well as the psychological history of individuals and to evaluate that from a prison operational perspective and not a clinical perspective.
 - Q. So you have no degrees in psychology or psychiatry?
 - A. That is correct, sir.
- Q. And no formal training other than undergraduate courses?
- A. That is correct other than the formal training that I received in my course of employment to interpret the psychological records of inmate population from an operational standpoint.
- Q. And that is just basically as a prison official; is that correct?
- A. As a prison official and receiving the expertise and training as well as teaching that to other correctional professionals; yes, sir.
- Q. You do not even claim to hold any expertise in psychiatry or psychology, do you?
 - A. I'm not board certified; no, sir.

James Aiken - Voir Dire Well, not only are you not board certified, you 1 don't hold any kind of degrees in that, do you? 2 BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, he hasn't been 3 tendered as an expert in psychology or psychiatry. Ι 4 don't understand the questions. 5 BY THE COURT: Well, certainly what you are 6 wanting him to testify to has some relationship to 7 those disciplines, so I'm going to let him voir dire. 8 BY MR. EVANS: 9 You hold no degrees as a psychologist or 10 Q. psychiatrist, do you? 11 12 Α. That is correct, sir. How many times have you been with the Defendant? 13 Q. 14 Α. One time, sir. 15 For how long? Q. 16 BY THE COURT: Now right now you are just voir diring him or whether he is an expert or not. 17 BY MR. EVANS: All right, sir. 18 BY THE COURT: That is another question. 19 BY MR. EVANS: Okay. I didn't know if the Court 20 wanted to go ahead and cover that at this time or not. 21 22 BY THE COURT: No, not at this time. BY MR. EVANS: All right. Your Honor, I think as 23 24 far as just voir diring on this part, that's all I 25 have. 26 BY THE COURT: What are you tendering him as? BY MR. DE GRUY: As an expert in classification 27

of inmates and the determination of future

dangerousness and the operation of correctional

28

James Aiken - Continued Direct facilities.

BY THE COURT: I think in light of his educational background and his past experience, he is qualified to testify in that field as an expert. However, his testimony in this case must not be generalizations but case specific.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.

BY THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DE GRUY:

- Q. Mr. Aiken, with respect to this case, have you reviewed Mr. Flowers' prison and jail records?
 - A. Yes, I have.
 - Q. And have you interviewed Mr. Flowers?
- A. Yes, I have.
 - Q. Are these the things you normally do in the classification process of an individual?
 - A. That is correct. The only possible exception of it is that I don't interview every inmate that I am making a classification decision on. And I have found that my proficiency in proper classifying inmate population was not diminished in relationship to whether I interviewed or didn't interview that particular inmate.
 - Q. Can you estimate over your career and maybe you have mentioned this; how many times you have classified inmates?
 - A. Literally thousands and thousands of times.
 - Q. And I believe you just testified that you don't always have an opportunity to interview in making that -- is that just done on records?

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI

PAGES NUMBERED 1921-2019

VOLUME 21 of 21

EXHIBIT

ELECTRONIC DISK

Case #2004-DP-00738-SCT

COURT APPEALED FROM : Circuit Court

COUNTY: Montgomery

TRIAL JUDGE : C. E. Morgan III

Curtis Giovanni Flowers v. State of Mississippi

Betty W. Sephton, Clerk

TRIAL COURT #: 2003-0071-CR

James Aiken - Continued Direct

A. What we do, yes, sir, is to review the official records, those people that are qualified as well as responsible for the safety and custody and security of the inmate. What they say about the inmate, I value, yes.

- Q. And I believe you testified you have developed and evaluated classification systems?
- A. That is correct. Not only -- and I don't want to get too technical, but objective classification systems which people commonly know as maximum security, medium security, or minimum security as well as internal classification systems in relationship to the person's assignment within a facility.
- Q. Now you have been asked about your expertise in psychology or psychiatry. In the corrections process, is it normal to rely on records from those type of professionals?
- A. It is normal to review those records collectively as well as other variables and make a determination in relationship to operational aspects of a prison. But as far having the clinical qualifications as a psychiatrist, psychiatric evaluation, and making a diagnosis, no.
- Q. So in all of these prisons that you have worked in around the country and here in Mississippi, is it a psychologist or a psychiatrist who determines classification, or is it a corrections professional?
 - A. Corrections professional.
- Q. And you have already mentioned that you reviewed the behavioral records of Mr. Flowers. Did you also, did you review any medical records?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. And did that include psychological testing, or do

James Aiken - Continued Direct you know?

- A. If I remember correctly, it did have some reference to some psychological issues such as attempted suicide or something of that nature; yes, sir.
- Q. He was evaluated while, when he was taken into the system previously?
- A. Yes, sir. It's a common component of a classification process to look at some type of psychological status of an inmate coming into the system.
- Q. What is the better predictor of future institutional behavior, behavior in the community prior to incarceration or behavior while incarcerated?
- A. In laymen's terms your community behavior is a better predictor of future community behavior. Your prison behavior is a better predictor of your future prison behavior.
- Q. From your review of the records, can you tell us how long Mr. Flowers was institutionalized?
 - A. For at least seven years, six or seven years, yes.
- Q. And in that time has he spent most of that time in what is called close security?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Could you tell us what close security is?
- A. Close security is a custom. You have maximum security; then you have close security, and it's a highly supervised environment. It's a very high secure environment where staff has total control, where staff always has a visual line of sight to you and know your whereabouts 24 hours a day, seven days a week. And usually in this

James Aiken - Continued Direct environment you are housed with very dangerous, predatorial, 1 2 violent inmate population. Can you tell us how many significant rule 3 Q. violations the average close security inmate would have? 4

> BY THE COURT: I'm sorry; I didn't hear your question.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, that is not relevant.

BY MR. DE GRUY: I'm asking him if based on his experience, he could tell me what an average or typical number of significant rule violations for a closed security inmate?

BY MR. EVANS: That can't have any relevance to this--

BY MR. DE GRUY: -- It absolutely does because otherwise the jury is going to hear about Mr. Flowers in a vacuum. They won't know what context to put in his particular record.

BY THE COURT: Okay. I will allow it.

BY THE WITNESS:

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Would you mind repeating the question, please.
- Can you tell us how many significant rule Q. Yes. violations the average or the typical close security inmate would have?
- It would not be uncommon for an inmate in a maximum Α. or close security to have 30, 40, 50 write-ups over a period of time of five to seven or ten years. And the reason why is not necessarily the person is bad, but he is constantly under supervision. And people in these environments that are supervising these environments, they document everything.

James Aiken - Continued Direct Every rule violation, every incident is documented.

- Q. In reviewing the files of Mr. Flowers over his years in jail and in prison and particularly, in prison; that is where he has been in close security. How many significant disciplinary violations has he had?
 - A. Zero.

- Q. Is that unusual?
- A. That is exceptional to say the least. It's a miracle for a person to be able to live in this very volatile, dangerous environment with constant supervision from security staff and not be written up or documented for any violation or rules regulations, policy procedures, or criminal violations while incarcerated.
- Q. And you said you interviewed Mr. Flowers as part of the, what would be the classification process. What did you learn about him from that interview?
- A. The purpose of my interview is to further validate what I have already read in the records. Also, it was of great interest to me to see this type of person that it was disciplinary free for such a period of time within this close environment because I quite honestly, have not seen anyone I don't think, maybe one or two in my whole career that has survived like that. And I found an individual that responded with all respect, an individual that knew in a prison environment you follow the rules and regulations and you do what you were told when you were told to do it. As well as to understand that other people around you, and this is from Mr. Flowers to which is further validated in the record, you just suck it up, and you take it. You take throwing cold

James Aiken - Continued Direct water or hot water on you, and you don't say anything.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I object. That is not proper, and he knows it's not.

BY THE COURT: Sustained unless it is backed up by some evidence. There is nothing in this record that would indicate that occurred.

BY MR. DE GRUY:

- Q. Mr. Aiken, we will move on. But what you are testifying to is based on your interview and your review of the records?
- A. That is correct. What I received directly from Mr. Flowers on last evening.
- Q. And I will move on to the next question. You are familiar with the Mississippi classification system?
- A. Yes, I have familiarity with it, and it's not unusual with other classification systems within the United States.
- Q. Is there a certain level of security a person would receive based on the crime of conviction?
- A. Yes. And what that basically means with Mr. Flowers is I don't care how good he is. I don't care how he complies with the rules and regulations. His community behavior, the criminal acts in which he has been convicted of will prevent him from being exposed to the community again. And that is forever, as long as he is living. It prevents him no matter how good he is from going to a minimum security or trying to get him back into the community because that is taken off the table now. He is in prison not for rehabilitation--

James Aiken - Continued Direct BY MR. EVANS: -- Your Honor, again I'm going to 1 2 have to object--BY THE WITNESS: -- He is in prison for 3 4 incapacitation --BY MR. EVANS: This is directly relation to 5 Wilcher. It is not proper. It is irrelevant to what 6 7 we are doing here. BY THE COURT: That is sustained as to that type 8 9 of testimony. BY MR. DE GRUY: I'm sorry, Your Honor. 10 BY MR. DE GRUY: 11 12 Now you are talking about where Mr. Flowers, not in Q. general, where Mr. Flowers, where his classification falls. 13 14 BY MR. EVANS: Same objection on relevance. BY THE COURT: That is sustained. 15 BY MR. DE GRUY: I think it goes directly to 16 17 future dangerousness. BY THE COURT: Well, it flies right in the face 18 of the case law, Mr. de Gruy, also in relation to that 19 specific part of his testimony about sentencing and 20 what that means, I mean what that sentence means. 21 BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, certainly everyone 22 would agree that the only options are death or life 23 without parole. So that is--24 BY MR. EVANS: -- Your Honor, I would ask that he 25 ask questions and not testify at this point. 26 27 BY THE COURT: I have sustained the objection. 28 Let's move on.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, just so I am clear

1

2

3

5

4

6

8 9

7

10 11

12

13

15 16

14

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28 29 Α. No, sir.

BY MR. EVANS:

Your Honor, I don't think that is

James Aiken - Continued Direct on this, I'm not going to be allowed to ask this witness about what maximum security conditions are? BY THE COURT: No, I didn't say that.

BY MR. DE GRUY:

- Could you describe to us -- you have said Q. Okay. that Mr. Flowers would be placed in maximum security. Could you describe for us what maximum security is?
- Maximum security is an environment that is Of course, we know about the fences and the super secure. qun towers as well as the correctional staff that are specially trained to manage this population. They have the equipment; they have the training to control this individual in just about any behavior this individual would possibly demonstrate. Additionally, they are authorized to use lethal force if required; that is; they can kill an inmate if that inmate does not conform to a certain standard of behavior if required. Also, they have total control as to where that inmate goes, what that inmate eats, who that inmate talks to. They can go through his personal belongings. They can go through his personal body, if required, to insure that this individual is safe as well as will not pose a future dangerousness to other inmate population, staff, as well as the community.
- If you were the warden supervising Curtis Flowers Q. in prison under a sentence of life without parole, would Curtis be a person that you would have concerns for your staff or anyone else's safety?

James Aiken - DIRECT - CROSS relevant.

BY THE COURT: I think in the light of the way I qualified him, he can -- that would be a question about future behavior.

BY THE WITNESS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

A. The answer to that question is yes. I would feel very comfortable keeping this individual in my prison as the warden without him posing a risk of harm to staff, inmates, as well as the general community, and I have supervised people like that for many years.

BY MR. DE GRUY: I have no further questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. How many times did you say you have talked to the Defendant?
 - A. One time, sir.
 - Q. When was that?
- A. Last evening.
- 18 Q. For how long?
 - A. I would say 40 minutes at the max.
 - Q. So you are basing your information on him on a 40 minute interview?
 - A. That is not correct, sir.
 - Q. Well, how many other times have you talked to him?
 - A. I didn't base my opinion on just an interview.
 - Q. How many other times have you talked to him?
 - A. None.
 - Q. How many other inmates in maximum security at Parchman have you checked records?
 - A. I have not reviewed individual records of inmates

James Aiken - CROSS at Parchman.

- Q. Oh, so you don't know whether anybody else over there has any violations or not then, do you?
- A. Not from that standpoint, sir, but in my being here and providing technical assistance, it is of personal knowledge that inmates that are in that type of facility have a number of write-ups, at least a certain segment of that population.
- Q. Mississippi Penitentiary at Parchman, how many of them there have you checked their records?
 - A. I have not checked their records, sir.
- Q. And you are attempting to guess at what his future dangerousness is; is that right?
 - A. No, sir. I am not guessing.
 - Q. Oh, you are not; you know? You can read minds?
- A. No, sir. What we are saying in this profession is no, we cannot predict human behavior in absolute terms. I don't think anyone can do that. But what I am saying is that we have gotten very proficient at better predicting human behavior.
- Q. Of course, you don't predict it at Parchman, do you?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. In your evaluation, what you have been furnished to look at, were you told about the facts of this crime?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Were you told that four innocent individuals were shot in the head and murdered?
 - A. Yes, sir.

James Aiken - CROSS

BY MR. EVANS: One second, Your Honor.

(Mr. Evans gets out easel and puts boards of pictures on them.)

Q. I want to show you several different photographs. To start with I will show you Exhibit 16A, 17A, 19A, 18A, 12A, 15A, 13A, 14A, 21A, 20A, 23A, and 22A. And I will ask that you look at these photographs if you would?

BY THE WITNESS: Your Honor, may I have permission to walk over and look at them?

BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.

BY THE WITNESS: Thank you.

(Long pause while witness walks over to photographs, looks at them, and them resumes witness stand.)

BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. Have you had an opportunity to look at those pictures?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Can you tell me how you can say that somebody that can commit crimes like this would not be future dangerous?
- A. To the community, yes, sir. In a prison environment, I can manage that type of population.
 - Q. You can?
- A. When I say I, I'm talking about correctional facilities throughout the United States can manage this type of population, especially when you look at his particular record within a correctional environment.
- Q. It's different when you have got somebody watching you all the time, isn't it?
 - A. Yes, sir.

Ι

James Aiken - CROSS Would you agree with me that a person that could 1 commit that type of crime is going to be always dangerous? 2 To the community, yes, sir. 3 BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I have nothing further 4 of this witness. 5 BY MR. DE GRUY: No questions, Your Honor. 6 BY THE COURT: Is he finally excused? 7 BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, he is finally excused. 8 BY THE COURT: You are free to go, sir. 9 BY THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir. 10 WITNESS EXCUSED. 11 BY THE COURT: Who will you have next? 12 BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, the Defense rests. 13 DEFENDANT RESTS ON SENTENCING PHASE. 14 BY THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Evans? 15 BY MR. EVANS: No, sir. 16 BOTH SIDES FINALLY REST. 17 BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, that 18 completes the testimony at this stage of the trial. 19 will ask you to go to the jury room. I have to 20 consider some instructions to give you before the 21 lawyers argue this case as we did in the first phase 22 of the trial. These will take me a little time, so I 23 24 will call you when we get it done, and we will come 25 back, and I will read them to you, and they can argue

JURY LEFT THE COURTROOM.

the case.

26

27

28

29

(CONSIDERATION OF JURY INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SENTENCING PHASE WITH THE JURY OUT AS FOLLOWS:)

1932 Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT 1 BY THE COURT: Do I even have y'all's 2 instructions? I don't think I do. 3 BY MR. HILL: These are as good a state as I can get them in at this time. 4 BY MR. DE GRUY: Do you have copies for me? 5 (State's and Defense Counsel confer out of the 6 7 hearing of the Court Reporter.) SENTENCING INSTRUCTION NO. 1: BY THE COURT: 8 in relation to the State's sentencing instruction number 1, 9 there are four of them, I think. Well, I know there are. I 10 think they will all contain the same language. What do you 11 say Mr. de Gruy? I know they have got, as far as mitigating 12 13 circumstances, they have got to have some discussion, but what about the rest of it? 14 15 BY MR. DE GRUY: First, we have submitted DS-1A 16 17 18

through D which it's our position that is a correct statement of the law. It is essentially the same as the one they have proposed, and that is the instruction that we are asking for. But as to this, this instruction, our first objection is on the listing of the aggravating circumstances. I'm sorry; would you like me to stand to argue?

> BY THE COURT: That--

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY MR. DE GRUY: I apologize.

That is all right. BY THE COURT:

BY MR. DE GRUY: They have condensed two statutory aggravators into one and enumerated it as one aggravator. The capital offense was committed for pecuniary That is an aggravating circumstance under the statute. That the capital offense was committed during the course of a Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT robbery is a second, a separate aggravating circumstance.

The Mississippi Supreme Court has clearly said you can't give the two together, and therefore, if you can't give them together enumerated as one and two, you shouldn't be able to give them together in one instruction. And we have statutory aggravating circumstances. They are limited to statutory aggravating circumstances, and they must follow the language of that statute, and they can't get around the willing rule by combining them in one sentence.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, specifically on that, this is the way that our State Supreme Court has directed that it be given. They are saying that it should not be given separately; they should be given together.

Specifically, in a murder for robbery case, the aggravating circumstance should read: "The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the course of a robbery." Simons v. State, 805 So.2d 452; Turner v. State, 732 So.2d 937;

Irving v. State, 441 So.2d 846. And a long line of cases specifically state that that is the way that the aggravating factors should be given.

BY THE COURT: That's what the law says.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, so the record is clear, our objection is based on the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment as well as the state constitution, and our position is as previously stated.

BY THE COURT: Okay. But the case law is that it should not be done the way you have indicated, that it should be done in the way this is done.

BY MR. DE GRUY: So it's clear, I'm not

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT advocating that it be listed as one and two. I am saying they cannot be listed in the same case.

BY THE COURT: Okay. Well, that is not the law, so that objection is overruled. Okay, is that the only objection as to the aggravating circumstance?

BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor. The aggravating circumstance that is listed here is not an aggravating circumstance that was submitted in the prior trials. We covered this at pretrial; that the aggravating circumstances that were to be submitted were the aggravators that had been previously submitted. And also, there is absolutely no evidence that this offense was committed to avoid arrest.

we did not go into that on the other trials because we were -- I think we did on one of them, but it was because we were trying separate cases. In this case we are trying all four deaths together. The fact that all four people in the store were killed, I think, is in itself evidence of the fact that he was killing everybody there so that he wouldn't be apprehended. There would be no witnesses left. So I think specifically this aggravating circumstance has been covered in the facts and is appropriate in this case.

motions on this case. And the motion was for the State to designate what the aggravating factors were, and at that time the statement was made by the State that the aggravating factors would be the same as what it had been in the earlier trials. And based on that, I don't think you can use it in this case. They have no notice that you were going to use

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT that until this time.

this state that we are not required to produce aggravating factors until the case is over and the Court can determine whether they were proven during the case. We covered that before. We told them that we would -- now I think I specifically stated that we were not required to prove them, that once the case was over, we would determine what we were going to use. I think we may have used that in one of the others; I'm not sure. I know it was submitted in discovery that it would be used in the other cases. And the law is clear that it's to be determined by the Court if it's a factor that came out in this trial.

BY MR. CARTER: Well, that doesn't reflect my memory, Your Honor, and I was at the hearing.

BY MR. EVANS: And the Court overruled their motion on that, Your Honor, specifically stating that it was something that had to be determined during the trial.

BY MR. CARTER: That doesn't reflect my memory either.

an affirmative statement at that time that they were going to use the aggravating circumstances or the aggravators that they used in the previous trials. If you have used it in a previous trial, I will allow you to use it in this trial. If you didn't, I'm not going to allow it. So y'all can determine that in a minute.

Okay. Mitigators. Well, was that all? I guess

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT

BY MR. DE GRUY: --Yes, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: There are no other aggravators.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor. We have submitted in the, in our instruction a list of the mitigating circumstances, and we have also, in the event the Court refuses DS-1A through D, we have also submitted a list of mitigating circumstances instruction listing mitigating circumstances.

the long form that lists, tells the jury what they have to do as designated in Sentencing Instruction for the State 1.

That lists the factors that they must consider, how they go about it, which is essentially the same instruction that y'all have submitted. In that I'm going to list the aggravating circumstances that they can consider. I am going to also list the Inman factors that they must consider, what their different verdicts can be.

And also, I'm going to list in that the mitigators.

I am not going to give a separate instruction on the mitigating factors. Whatever mitigating factors will be submitted to the jury will be submitted in this instruction.

So I need to know which ones you want.

One, I will go over what you have got on your instruction, and let's see where we are. "Curtis Flowers has no history of prior criminal activity." The State has got no objection to that one, do they?

BY MR. EVANS: No, sir.

BY THE COURT: Okay. The next one, "Mr. Flowers has an excellent prison record." The only testimony we have

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT about that one way or another is that he does not have any 1 violations while he was in there. 2 BY MR. EVANS: And--3 BY THE COURT: -- Whether excellent is a correct 4 statement is another story. 5 BY MR. EVANS: And I don't know that anybody has 6 actually said that they have seen his record. 7 BY THE COURT: No, I think Mr. Aiken said he had 8 9 seen--BY MR. DE GRUY: -- We had testimony this morning. 10 BY THE COURT: Yeah, he did that. 11 Well, if you believe him. 12 BY MR. EVANS: 13 BY THE COURT: Well, that is for the jury. I think it should at least reflect BY MR. EVANS: 14 the area that he said that he has no record of rules 15 violations or something like that. 16 BY THE COURT: I think that is what his testimony 17 was. We do not know what other records there might be in 18 relation to his prison record where you could necessarily 19 describe it as excellent. You could describe what he said, 20 what his examination showed. It will be up to the jury to 21 22 determine whether that is excellent or not. And I don't believe he testified it was excellent. He just testified it 23 was exceptional and that he had no rules violations. 24 25 will submit it with that, amended to that form. 26 BY MR. DE GRUY: We would -- so the Court is 27 saying we can substitute the word "exceptional"?

29 BY MR. DE GRUY: Well, that is what he testified

BY THE COURT: Well, no.

1938 Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT 1 to. 2 BY MR. EVANS: Which that is--BY THE COURT: -- Well, no, I don't think that is 3 exactly what he said. He said he had never seen many like 4 that, and he might have seen one or two in his life. What he 5 said was, he testified to that; that what he testified to was 6 that he had no rules violation in the six or seven years that 7 he was there, and he found -- you can put in there that he 8 found that -- he found to be unique, I guess would be a 9 description of it. 10 11 BY MR. EVANS: And again, Your Honor, that is based entirely on his opinion, which I think is not proper. 12 13 He can testify what the record is, but I think his opinion 14 would not be a proper thing to submit to this jury. 15 BY THE COURT: He was qualified as an expert. 16 has the right to give his opinion as to whether or not that 17 is a good record or a bad record. He did not testify it was excellent. He probably did, you probably could get it to 18 19 where it was good or bad. 20 I have no objection to putting in BY MR. EVANS: 21 there that he has had a good prison record. 22 BY THE COURT: With no rules violations. How 23 about that? 24 BY MR. EVANS: I do not object to that. 25 BY MR. DE GRUY: Okay.

(No audible response from either counsel.)

26

27

29

notes?

BY THE COURT: In the next one, I think the last

BY THE COURT: All right. Are y'all making

1939 Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT one, I think what is in evidence is that he does follow the 1 rules and regulations of prison. I don't know that there is 2 anything in the record that he is willing to work or that he 3 helps others in the prison. 4 BY MR. EVANS: Even further, Your Honor, 5 basically the way I understood the testimony is he does what 6 he is told because he has no choice. 7 BY THE COURT: Well, there again that's -- but 8 it's something for the jury to evaluate there. That's their 9 province. I'm just talking about what the facts show, and 10 that is an evaluation of the facts. I think what needs to 11 come out is "willing to work" because it's not, there is no 12 proof to that effect. And "he helps others in the prison"; I 13 don't recall any testimony to that effect. Other than that, 14 I think that --15 BY MR. HILL: -- Aren't "B" and "C" then, Your 16 Honor, exactly the same? 17 BY THE COURT: But I'm going to allow both. 18 how about "D"? You couldn't make an argument on that basis, 19 either one of you. 20 BY MR. EVANS: I don't think it's an appropriate 21 mitigator. I think it's something he can argue, but I do not 22 23 think it's an appropriate mitigator.

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. And if even the Court allowed him to argue it, I don't think it's a proper

BY THE COURT: Well, there is some case law to

mitigator.

the effect you can't argue.

24

25

26

27

28

29

(State's Counsel confer briefly.)

1940 Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT BY MR. EVANS: 1 Yeah. The instruction itself, I 2 think--BY THE COURT: -- where it has the life 3 imprisonment stuff? 4 5 BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. BY THE COURT: Okay. As one of the verdict 6 7 forms? BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. 8 9 BY THE COURT: Okay. I'm not going to allow that as a mitigator. "E" is okay and "F" and "G". I don't see 10 11 any problem there. BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, the only problem I 12 13 have with "G" is there is nothing in the record that 14 indicates that any circumstances of the crime would be a 15 mitigator. 16 BY MR. DE GRUY: I think that is the catch all 17 language. 18 BY THE COURT: I think it is too. 19 BY MR. EVANS: I will withdraw it. 20 BY THE COURT: As a matter of fact, that is 21 verbatim just almost as to what the catch all is. We have 22 included that in every one we have ever done. So that stays. 23 Okay. Any others that you want that are supported by the evidence? 24 25 BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor. I think that 26 covers it. 27 BY THE COURT: Okay. Then that is the instruction that I'm going to give with those amendments to 28

I would ask that we take a short recess while y'all get

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT that instruction. There are four of them. When you get those four in that form, then we will to go the others. How about that?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Okay.

(DURING A RECESS FOR THE COURT REPORTER TO TYPE THE NOW AMENDED SENTENCING INSTRUCTION 1, THE JURY WAS SENT TO LUNCH. WHILE THEY WERE GONE, PROCEEDINGS CONTINUED IN OPEN COURT WITH ALL COUNSEL AND THE DEFENDANT PRESENT BUT WITH THE JURY STILL OUT:)

BY MR. EVANS: Before we go forward, there is something I wanted to put on the instructions to make it clear.

BY THE COURT: Okay.

that have been given, the State in the instructions that I have got that we had prepared for the first two trials; in one of them we had prepared during the course of a robbery for pecuniary gain, great risk of death to many people, and to avoid apprehension. We had those three. In the other one, great risk of death to many people and the robbery for pecuniary gain. But to make sure that I was representing things right for the Court, we called Judy Martin with the AG's Office and asked her to look and make sure what was actually submitted to the jury in both cases. And what was submitted in both cases was robbery for pecuniary gain and great risk of death to many people. All three of them had been prepared, but that is the two that were submitted.

In this case I don't wish to use the one great risk

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT of death to many people. The two that I would ask to use are the robbery for pecuniary gain and to avoid arrest and apprehension.

And I think, if I'm not mistaken, all of this in previous discovery, all three of them had been furnished in previous discovery. Plus they were prepared in the original instructions, but they were not submitted to the jury like that. I just wanted to make sure that I don't misrepresent anything to the Court on that.

BY MR. DE GRUY: We maintain our objection to them.

BY MR. CARTER: And I probably did the most intensive reading of the file, and the only two that I'm aware of are the two that we discussed when we were in the motion hearing that day.

BY MR. EVANS: And I would have to go back and look. It might take five minutes; it may take a long time, but I'm if I'm not mistaken, these were all three furnished in discovery.

a motion for you to divulge which ones that you were going to rely on. I know that there was some discussions about what went on at the other trial. I do not know what you replied, what your reply to that motion was or what your discovery showed in that regard. If, in fact, you put something in written discovery where you said that that would be one of the factors that you might consider, that might change the situation. If that is not there though, I think they are entitled to rely on the communications we had at that

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT hearing.

I agree with you that the facts can develop different things, but in preparation for trial, once they file that motion, they ought to be entitled to at least know that you might do something else. So I need to see what you did in relation to that discovery.

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. And if I can't find it real quick, then we will just go on. I'm not going to waste the Court's time.

BY THE COURT: Okay, all right. And if he cannot produce that and we have to strike it, is it okay, folks, if we just strike that out, black it out rather than having to go through typing all this again?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Okay, all right. Y'all, somebody sitting there in that back, I do not have the jury here, and I'm discussing these things. Do not let them come in the courtroom until you have told me that they are here. Okay?

(Off the record briefly. Mr. Evans reenters and hands something to the Court.)

BY THE COURT: Okay, these are notices that were provided prior to the first trial? Is that correct?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Were these same things provided to these gentlemen for this trial?

BY MR. EVANS: No, sir, because the Court ordered that it wasn't necessary. The Court overruled their motion that we have to provide aggravators.

BY MS. FERRARO: Your Honor, I was at that

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT hearing making notes, and I remember we filed a motion asking 1 about that specific aggravator of the avoiding arrest 2 aggravator, and Mr. Evans said he was only going to use the 3 two aggravators that he used previously. And you said that 4 was your ruling, is that he was going to use the ones he had 5 already used. And that's my recollection of the hearing, and 6 I was only making notes in the argument. I don't know if 7 that is true. You might want to check the transcript. 8 BY THE COURT: And nobody drew a written order 9 for me to sign, did they? 10 11 BY MR. CARTER: No, sir. BY THE COURT: I'm going to stand by my original 12 13 ruling, and I'm going to delete it from these instructions. (Pause) Okay, now I don't know that everybody has looked at 14 all these since we have done all the typing and whatever. So 15 I will give them back to y'all if y'all want to--16 17 BY MR. EVANS: You have seen them, didn't you, Clyde? 18 BY THE COURT: Y'all have seen them, I quess, 19 20 because you were in there when Linda was typing them. BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. 21 BY MR. DE GRUY: We haven't seen them. 22 23 BY THE COURT: The deletion is I deleted number 2 24 as far as an aggravator. 25 BY THE COURT REPORTER: I put copies on both of 26 their tables.

BY THE COURT: Okay, all right. Then, Mr. de Gruy, have you stated all of your objections to SS-1A, SS-1B,

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yeah, we have copies.

27

28

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT SS-1C, and SS-1D?

BY MR. DE GRUY: The only change we would request, without waiving the instruction we have previously submitted, is that in the first -- the second sentence, "You must now decide whether the Defendant will be sentenced to death or life imprisonment," we would ask that "without parole" be inserted there.

in this instruction, and if they return life imprisonment, the only form that they can return is that form of the verdict, and it says "life without parole." So I think that sufficiently covers it. If they return a verdict other than that, I'm going to send them back to return that verdict because they have only got two that they can return. I'm going to give those four instructions.

COURT INSTRUCTIONS C-2, C-3, C-4: BY THE COURT:
Okay, I don't think you have seen these. These are stock sentencing instructions.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Would be 2, 3 and 4?

BY THE COURT: Yeah, 2, 3 and 4. One is adopting the testimony. Okay, you have got them?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes.

BY THE COURT: Then it's the foreman and then the mere counting instruction. Any objection to those?

BY MR. DE GRUY: On C-3, the foreman instruction, our only request would be a final sentence that basically tells them the same thing. Upon this form that has been approved by the Supreme Court, whatever verdict is returned should be signed by the foreman, and therefore, there should

1946 Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT be a sentence, In the event you unanimously find that the 1 Defendant should be sentenced to life without parole, the 2 foreman shall, and language there. If you look at the SS-1 3 instructions. 4 BY THE COURT: Yeah, I know. Right. How about 5 instead of "the," "any"? 6 BY MR. DE GRUY: That's all right. 7 BY THE COURT: That would work? The last two 8 9

"And the foreman shall thereafter affix his or her words. signature to any verdict."

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY MR. DE GRUY: I think that the sentence is referring only to the death verdict. It specifically says that.

BY THE COURT: (Pause) There again, that instruction gives them the three things that they can find, and it has a line for them to sign. And certainly, there are significant things they have to find in relation to the death In relation to the other verdicts, all they have to penalty. do is sign it, and I'm not going to confuse them with all that. I think if you read the instructions as a whole, it clearly advises what to do. I don't have any problem to changing "the" to "any."

BY MR. DE GRUY: We will accept that without waiving our request for the full sentence.

BY THE COURT: Okay. How would it be prejudiced by not doing the other way?

BY MR. DE GRUY: That was the whole point that the Supreme Court discussed in the old form of the verdict that only had one signature line, that the jury may not

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT consider any other option. It would lead the jury or may lead a jury in following the instructions mechanically to only return a death verdict. And that was the rational in the Court in which they said in the future, provide signature lines for all.

BY THE COURT: Okay, well, what about if we change it this way then. If you unanimously reach a verdict on sentencing, the foreman shall cause the verdict to be written in the form and manner prescribed in Schedule 1, and the foreman shall thereafter affix his or her signature to the verdict?

BY MR. DE GRUY: I have no objection to that.

BY THE COURT: How about that, Mr. Evans?

BY MR. EVANS: No objection.

remember what I just said. (Pause while the Court writes.)

Let me read it back to you again. "If you unanimously reach a verdict as to sentence, the foreman shall cause the verdict to be written in the form and manner prescribed in Sentencing Instruction 1, and the foreman shall thereafter affix his or her signature to the verdict"?

BY MR. DE GRUY: We have no objection to that.

BY MR. EVANS: It is fine.

BY THE COURT: Okay. All right, Sentencing
Instruction 2 is given. 3 is going to be given as amended.
4 is given. And that is, for the record, that is C-2, C-3
and C-4.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, I understand the ruling on the first, on the long instruction that we were

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT talking about, but just so the record is clear. We would 1 also ask that "without parole" be inserted after "life 2 imprisonment" in this instruction. I understand that you 3 have ruled on that, but I--4 BY THE COURT: -- Okay, my ruling is that it is 5 included in there and that they are adequately instructed as 6 to what their verdict must be and adequately instructed as to 7 what the penalties are. Was that all -- I have got too many 8 papers up here. What else did y'all have? Or was that it? 9 BY MR. EVANS: I think that was it. 10 BY THE COURT: Okay. I will go over the verdict 11 12 form in a minute. INSTRUCTION NO. DS-1A, DS-1B, DS-1C and DS-1D: 13 BY THE COURT: Okay Defendant's S-1A is refused as repetitive 14 of the Court's sentencing instruction, as is Defendant's 15 S-1B, C and D. 16 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-2: BY THE COURT: What do y'all 17 18 say to DS-2? 19 BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, the only problem, I don't like the part in here and I don't think it's 20 21 appropriate where it says, "I cannot stress to you enough 22 that the focus of your deliberations during this phase is not the same as an ordinary case." I don't think that would be 23 24 appropriate. 25 BY THE COURT: Mr. de Gruy. Do you have any

on the law. My job is not to make commentary on the death

BY MR. DE GRUY: No, sir.

26

27

28

29

argument?

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT penalty, and that's what this instruction does. And the rest of the instruction is covered by Sentencing Instruction number 1. Therefore, it's refused.

INSTRUCTION NO. DS-3: BY MR. EVANS: DS-3, I would object to because it's the Court bringing race into this case, and race has no bearing in the court system.

about that is not to be injected into the case. I have instructed them at the initial phase of this trial about bias or prejudice, and I'm going to refuse that instruction.

INSTRUCTION NO. DS-4: BY MR. EVANS: Object to D-4 as being an improper comment. There is a presumption of innocence. There is no presumption that there are no aggravating circumstances because once we have proven the fact that it was a capital murder, there automatically is an aggravating circumstance, so there is no presumption. The only thing that is important here is what the burden is on the jury, and that is covered by the instructions.

BY THE COURT: Any response?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Well, we think the aggravators do have to be found again beyond a reasonable doubt by this jury.

BY THE COURT: But isn't that in Sentencing Instruction number 1 --

BY MR. EVANS: --Yes, sir--

BY THE COURT: --as to exactly what they must do and the burden of proof that they must have?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Okay. I think the Sentencing

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT Instruction number 1 -- well, the first four state the law 1 and tells the jury what they must do and what their 2 obligations are and what the law is. And that is refused as 3 being repetitive. 4 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-5: BY MR. EVANS: DS-5 now 5 should just have one aggravating circumstance instead of two. 6 BY MR. DE GRUY: I agree with that. 7 (Pause while the Court marks on the instruction.) 8 BY THE COURT: Any objection to the thing, the 9 amendment to that instruction? D-5, DS-5? 10 BY MR. EVANS: No, sir. I don't think I have any 11 objection to the rest of it. Of course, that is not the only 12 thing they are to consider because all of the evidence from 13 the first phase has been introduced. I think because of 14 that, since it's already, I think that has already been given 15 in the Court's instruction. I think it might be misleading 16 but. 17 I'm going to give it, but it needs BY THE COURT: 18 19 to be given in this form. "I have previously read to you the one aggravating circumstance which the law permits you to 20 consider. This is the only aggravating circumstance you may 21 consider. However, before you may consider this factor, you 22 23 must find that factor is established by the evidence beyond a

BY MR. EVANS: Now I think that is a correct statement of the law.

reasonable doubt."

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY THE COURT: Okay, and you have no objection to those amendments, I am sure?

BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor.

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT I'm going to give this one; I'm BY THE COURT: 1 going to give DS-5 as amended. We are going to have to 2 3 redraw it. INSTRUCTION NO. DS-6: BY THE COURT: In light of 4 5 giving--BY MR. DE GRUY: --Yeah, we will withdraw 6. 6 7 BY THE COURT: Okay. INSTRUCTION NO. DS-7: BY MR. EVANS: I think that 8 9 all of how the procedure is already more properly covered in the other sentencing instructions. And it's trying to 10 explain "reasonable doubt" --11 BY THE COURT: I think DS-7 is repetitive. 12 is refused. Also, I agree it does try to define "reasonable 13 doubt." 14 15 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-8: BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I think this is misleading and improper. The Court -- I have 16 17 an instruction here that if they are requesting an instruction on mitigating circumstances, has been approved 18 and given by this Court many times, and I would offer it. 19 (Hands to Defense Counsel.) 20 21 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-10 AND C-5: BY MR. DE GRUY: That is essentially our DS-10. We have the word "individual" 22 underlined to stress that it is their individual decision 23 24 that the law requires. 25 (Mr. Hill hands a document to the Court.) 26 BY MR. EVANS: I think Blue v. State, 674--27 BY THE COURT: -- As far as the underlining?

29 BY MR. DE GRUY: Sir?

don't allow any underlining.

28

1952 Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT No, I'm just talking about this BY MR. EVANS: 1 Blue v. State, 674 So.2d 1184, I think that is 2 instruction. the instruction that they said was appropriate if the defense 3 requests it. 4 BY MR. DE GRUY: And I think that is our DS-10 5 6 unless I missed a word somewhere. BY THE COURT: Okay. Then except you have got 7 "individual" underlined, and I think that is inappropriate to 8 emphasize any part of the instruction. I'm going to give 9 this one that the State has submitted in lieu of DS-10 10 because there is no underlining of "individual" on there. 11 And let's see what I'm going to number it. For the sake of 12 the record, I will number that C-5. In light of that, I'm 13 going to refuse DS-8 and DS-10. 14 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-9: BY MR. EVANS: I think what 15 is in 9 is better covered by that other instruction also. 16 BY THE COURT: I think it's superfluous. 17 going to refuse it. That is DS-9. 18 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-11: BY THE COURT: And I think 19 we have already covered mitigation. I have given a 20 mitigation instruction. DS-11 is refused, also on the basis 21 that "individual" is once again underlined. 22 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-12: BY THE COURT: DS-12 is 23 covered by the sentencing instructions given at the outset. 24 25

So therefore it's refused.

26

27

28

29

INSTRUCTION NO. DS-13: BY THE COURT: DS-14 [sic] is a statement of the mitigating circumstances. It's a restatement of them. They are contained in the first sentencing instruction. Also, the ones contained in DS-13

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT are not consistent with the ones that I granted, so it's 1 2 refused. INSTRUCTION NO. DS-14: BY THE COURT: Okay, what 3 do you say to DS-14? 4 BY MR. EVANS: I would object to 14. I don't 5 think it's a proper instruction for the Court to give. 6 would be the Court trying to predict what the legislature may 7 do in the future. 8 BY THE COURT: Or tomorrow. I think it is 9 covered in the Court's instructions. Life in prison without 10 parole says what it says. It's refused. 11 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-15: BY MR. EVANS: I think 15 12 is, if I'm not mistaken, it's already covered in the Court's 13 instructions. 14 BY THE COURT: It was covered in the original S-1 15 16 at the guilt phase. I don't know that there is any particular language in this sentencing instruction about 17 18 that. It's a typical instruction that the Court gives at the first, as C-1. I'm going to give it. That is DS-15. 19 20 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-16: BY THE COURT: Okay, DS-16 is covered in the original sentencing instruction, of the 21 State Sentencing Instruction 1A, B, C and D. Therefore, it's 22 23 repetitious and it's refused. 24 INSTRUCTION NO. DS-17: BY MR. EVANS: The State 25 would object to 17.

BY THE COURT: Right. They are advised of that in the sentencing instruction, the original sentencing instruction, State's Sentence Instruction 1A, B, C and D. And this is an unnecessary comment on what is in that

26

27

28

29

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT instruction, so therefore it's refused. Okay.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, just for the record, I don't believe that it tells the jury what happens if they don't agree in the sentencing instructions that have been granted. And this jury has never been told what would happen, and they should be.

BY THE COURT: Well, I don't know that that is the law. That sentencing instruction we are giving them is the sentencing instruction that has been approved by the Court. That is the one we are going to give, and I'm going to refuse this one. Okay, I have got two--

BY MR. EVANS: -- Also, Your Honor, just for the record, to put in the record; another objection is that it indicates to the jury that they have to do this in a certain time period, and I don't think that would be proper.

BY THE COURT: It gives them directions, inappropriate directions as to how they are to perform their duty. Okay. I have got to have two of these fixed.

(WHEREUPON, THE COURT REPORTER LEFT THE COURTROOM
TO RETYPE TWO INSTRUCTIONS. THE COURT AND THE ATTORNEYS
CONFERRED CONCERNING SENTENCING INSTRUCTION SS-1A, 1B, 1C,
AND 1D WHILE THE COURT REPORTER WAS OUT OF THE COURTROOM BUT
MADE THE FOLLOWING RECORD UPON HER RETURN WITH THE JURY STILL
OUT:)

Sentence Instructions 1A, B, C, and D have been amended.

They have been amended in the following manner. On page 2 of each of those instructions, starting with the first new paragraph on that page, it will read as follows: "Consider

Consideration of Instructions - JURY OUT only the following element of aggravation in determining whether the death penalty should be imposed: The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the course of a robbery. You must unanimously find, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the preceding aggravating circumstance exists in this case to return the death penalty. If this aggravating circumstance is found not to exist, the death penalty may not be imposed, and you shall write the following verdict on a sheet of paper. 'We, the jury, find that the defendant should be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole.' If the above aggravating circumstance is found to exist beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must consider whether there are mitigating circumstances which outweigh the aggravating circumstance."

That amendment was made on each of these instructions. Is that right, gentlemen?

BY MR. DE GRUY: That's correct.

BY MR. HILL: That's correct, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: You are satisfied with that form?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.

instructions has been given by the Court. Instruction C-2 is given as Instruction Number 2. C-3 is given as Instruction number 3. C-4 is given as Instruction number 4. DS-5 is given as Instruction number 5. C-5 is given as Instruction number 6. And DS-15 is given as Instruction number 7. And also, then will be attached to these instructions a verdict form consistent with the form set forth in State Sentence Instruction 1A, B, C, and D. And I understand there is no

Court Reads Instructions to Jury objection to that verdict form? Is that correct?

BY MR. DE GRUY: No objection.

BY THE COURT: Okay. All right, we can file these, and we can proceed.

JURY ENTERS THE COURTROOM.

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, once again,
I must give you some instructions that apply to this phase of
the trial. There again, they are in writing, and you will be
able to take them to the jury room with you.

"You have found the defendant guilty of the crime of capital murder of Bertha Tardy. You must now decide whether the defendant will be sentenced to death or life imprisonment. In reaching your decision, you may objectively consider the detailed circumstances of the offense for which the defendant was convicted, and the character and record of the defendant himself. You should consider and weigh any aggravating and mitigating circumstances, as set forth later in this instruction, but you are cautioned not to be swayed by mere sentiment, conjecture, sympathy, passion, prejudice, public opinion, or public feeling.

To return the death penalty in this case, you must first unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that one or more of the following facts existed: That the defendant actually killed Bertha Tardy; That the defendant attempted to kill Bertha Tardy; That the defendant intended the killing of Bertha Tardy take place or; That the defendant contemplated that lethal force would be employed.

Next to return the death penalty, you must find the mitigating circumstances, those which tend to warrant the

Court Reads Instructions to Jury considered mitigating circumstances; Any other circumstance or combination of circumstances of the crime or of the life and character of Mr. Flowers which you believe should mitigate in favor of a sentence of life imprisonment.

If you find from the evidence that one or more of the preceding elements of mitigation exists, then you must consider whether it outweighs or overcomes any aggravating circumstances you previously found. In the event that you find that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstance, you may impose the death sentence. Should you find that the mitigating circumstances outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstance, you shall not impose the death sentence.

The verdict you return must be written on a separate sheet of paper signed by the foreman. Your verdict should be written in one of the following forms:

We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Bertha Tardy.

Here you list or itemize all facts found, if any, from the list under Section A of this instruction which you unanimously agree exists in this case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Next we, the jury unanimously find that the aggravating circumstance of: " And then you "List or itemize all of the aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of this instruction which you unanimously agree exist in this case as to Bertha Tardy beyond a reasonable doubt.

Court Reads Instructions to Jury
Exist beyond a reasonable doubt and is sufficient to impose
the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating
circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstance, and
we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer
death."

It's a line for the foreman of the jury to sign.

Or "We, the jury, find that the defendant should be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole." There again there is a line for the foreman of the jury to sign.

Or "We, the jury, are unable to agree unanimously on punishment." And there again there is a line for the foreman to sign.

"You have found the defendant guilty of the crime of capital murder of Robert Golden. You must now decide whether the defendant will be sentenced to death or life imprisonment. In reaching your decision, you may objectively consider the detailed circumstances of the offense for which the defendant was convicted, and the character and record of the defendant himself. You should consider and weigh any aggravating and mitigating circumstances, as set forth in this instruction, but you are cautioned not to be swayed by mere sentiment, conjecture, sympathy, passion, prejudice, public opinion, or public feeling.

To return the death penalty in this case, you must first unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that one or more of the following facts existed: That the defendant actually killed Robert Golden; That the defendant attempted to kill Robert Golden; That the defendant intended the killing of Robert Golden take place or; That the

Court Reads Instructions to Jury defendant contemplated that lethal force would be employed.

Next to return the death penalty, you must find the mitigating circumstances, those which tend to warrant the less severe penalty of life imprisonment without parole, do not outweigh the aggravating circumstance which tend to warrant the death penalty.

Consider only the following element of aggravation in determining whether the death penalty should be imposed:

The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the course of a robbery.

You must unanimously find, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the preceding aggravating circumstance exists in this case to return the death penalty. If this aggravating circumstance is found not to exist, the death penalty may not be imposed, and you shall write the following verdict on a sheet of paper.

'We, the jury, find that the defendant should be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole.'

If the above aggravating circumstance is found to exist beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must consider whether there are mitigating circumstances which outweigh the aggravating circumstance. Consider the following elements of mitigation in determining whether the death penalty should not be imposed:

Curtis Flowers has no history of prior criminal activity; Mr. Flowers has a good prison record with no rules violations; Mr. Flowers follows the rules and regulations of the prison, does as he is told, and does not cause trouble for guards; Mr. Flowers has a loving, supporting family and

Court Reads Instructions to Jury
many friends; Any and all factors relative to the background,
life, environment, and emotional makeup of Curtis Flowers,
which would be mitigating circumstances or could be
considered mitigating circumstances; Any other circumstance
or combination of circumstances of the crime or of the life
and character of Mr. Flowers which you believe should
mitigate in favor of a sentence of life imprisonment.

If you find from the evidence that one or more of the preceding elements of mitigation exists, then you must consider whether it or they outweigh or overcome any aggravating circumstance you previously found. In the event that you find that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstance, you may impose the death sentence. Should you find that the mitigating circumstances outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstance, you shall not impose the death sentence.

The verdict you return must be written on a separate sheet of paper signed by the foreman. Your verdict should be written in one of the following forms:

We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Robert Golden.

List or itemize all facts found, if any, from the list under Section A of this instruction which you unanimously agree exists in this case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Next we, the jury unanimously find that the aggravating circumstance of: " And you "List or itemize all of the aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of

Court Reads Instructions to Jury this instruction which you unanimously agree exist in this case as to Robert Golden beyond a reasonable doubt.

Exist beyond a reasonable doubt and is sufficient to impose the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstance, and we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer death."

The foreman should sign that verdict.

Or "We, the jury, find that the defendant should be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole." The foreman should sign that verdict.

Or "We, the jury, are unable to agree unanimously on punishment." The foreman shall sign that verdict.

"You have found the defendant guilty of the crime of capital murder of Carmen Rigby. You must now decide whether the defendant will be sentenced to death or life imprisonment. In reaching your decision, you may objectively consider the detailed circumstances of the offense for which the defendant was convicted, and the character and the record of the defendant himself. You should consider and weigh any aggravating and mitigating circumstances, as set forth later in this instruction, but you are cautioned not to be swayed by mere sentiment, conjecture, sympathy, passion, prejudice, public opinion, or public feeling.

To return the death penalty in this case, you must first unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that one or more of the following facts existed: That the defendant actually killed Carmen Rigby; That the defendant attempted to kill Carmen Rigby; That the defendant

Court Reads Instructions to Jury intended the killing of Carmen Rigby take place or; That the defendant contemplated that lethal force would be employed.

Next to return the death penalty, you must find the mitigating circumstances, those which tend to warrant the less severe penalty of life imprisonment without parole, do not outweigh the aggravating circumstances which tend to warrant the death penalty.

Consider only the following element of aggravation in determining whether the death penalty should be imposed:

The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the course of a robbery.

You must unanimously find, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the preceding aggravating circumstance exists in this case to return the death penalty. If this aggravating circumstance is found not to exist, the death penalty may not be imposed, and you shall write the following verdict on a sheet of paper.

'We, the jury, find that the defendant should be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole.'

If the above aggravating circumstance is found to exist beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must consider whether there are mitigating circumstances which outweigh the aggravating circumstance. Consider the following elements of mitigation in determining whether the death penalty should not be imposed:

Curtis Flowers has no history of prior criminal activity; Mr. Flowers has a good prison record with no rules violations; Mr. Flowers follows the rules and regulations of the prison, does as he is told, and does not cause trouble

Court Reads Instructions to Jury for guards; Mr. Flowers has a loving, supporting family and many friends; Any and all factors relative to the background, life, environment, and emotional makeup of Curtis Flowers, which would be mitigating circumstances or could be considered mitigating circumstances; Any other circumstance or combination of circumstances of the crime or of the life and character of Mr. Flowers which you believe should mitigate in favor of a sentence of life imprisonment.

If you find from the evidence that one or more of the preceding elements of mitigation exists, then you must consider whether it or they outweigh or overcome any aggravating circumstance you previously found. In the event that you find that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstance, you may impose the death sentence. Should you find that the mitigating circumstances outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstance, you shall not impose the death sentence.

The verdict you return must be written on a separate sheet of paper signed by the foreman. Your verdict should be written in one of the following forms:

We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Carmen Rigby.

List or itemize all facts found, if any, from the list under Section A of this instruction which you unanimously agree exists in this case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Next we, the jury unanimously find that the aggravating circumstance of: List or itemize all of the

Court Reads Instructions to Jury
aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of this
instruction which you unanimously agree exist in this case as
to Carmen Rigby beyond a reasonable doubt.

Exist beyond a reasonable doubt and is sufficient to impose

the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstance, and we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer death.

Or 'We, the jury, find that the defendant should be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole.'" As to that first sentence, of course, the foreman signs it, and the foreman signs the one I just read.

Or "We, the jury, are unable to agree unanimously on punishment." And the foreman signs that one.

"You have found the defendant guilty of the crime of capital murder of Derrick Stewart. You must now decide whether the defendant will be sentenced to death or life imprisonment. In reaching your decision, you may objectively consider the detailed circumstances of the offense for which the defendant was convicted, and the character and record of the defendant himself. You should consider and weigh any aggravating and mitigating circumstances, as set forth later in this instruction, but you are cautioned not to be swayed by mere sentiment, conjecture, sympathy, passion, prejudice, public opinion, or public feeling.

To return the death penalty in this case, you must first unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that one or more of the following facts existed: That the defendant actually killed Derrick Stewart; That the

Court Reads Instructions to Jury defendant attempted to kill Derrick Stewart; That the defendant intended the killing of Derrick Stewart take place or; That the defendant contemplated that lethal force would be employed.

Next to return the death penalty, you must find the mitigating circumstances, those which tend to warrant the less severe penalty of life imprisonment without parole, do not outweigh the aggravating circumstances which tend to warrant the death penalty.

Consider only the following element of aggravation in determining whether the death penalty should be imposed:

The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the course of a robbery.

You must unanimously find, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the preceding aggravating circumstance exists in this case to return the death penalty. If this aggravating circumstance is found not to exist, the death penalty may not be imposed, and you shall write the following verdict on a sheet of paper.

'We, the jury, find that the defendant should be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole.'

If the above aggravating circumstance is found to exist beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must consider whether there are mitigating circumstances which outweigh the aggravating circumstance. Consider the following elements of mitigation in determining whether the death penalty should not be imposed:

Curtis Flowers has no history of prior criminal activity; Mr. Flowers has a good prison record with no rules

Court Reads Instructions to Jury violations; Mr. Flowers follows the rules and regulations of the prison, does as he is told, and does not cause trouble for guards; Mr. Flowers has a loving, supporting family and many friends; Any and all factors relative to the background, life, environment, and emotional makeup of Curtis Flowers, which would be mitigating circumstances or could be considered mitigating circumstances; Any other circumstance or combination of circumstances of the crime or of the life and character of Mr. Flowers which you believe should mitigate in favor of a sentence of life imprisonment.

If you find from the evidence that one or more of the preceding elements of mitigation exists, then you must consider whether it or they outweigh or overcome any aggravating circumstance you previously found. In the event that you find that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstance, you may impose the death sentence. Should you find that the mitigating circumstances outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstance, you shall not impose the death sentence.

The verdict you return must be written on a separate sheet of paper and signed by the foreman. Your verdict should be written in one of the following forms:

We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Derrick Stewart.

List or itemize all facts found, if any, from the list under Section A of this instruction which you unanimously agree exists in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. Court Reads Instructions to Jury

Next we, the jury unanimously find that the aggravating circumstance of: " And you "List or itemize all of the aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of this instruction which you unanimously agree exist in this case as to Derrick Stewart beyond a reasonable doubt.

Exist beyond a reasonable doubt and is sufficient to impose the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstance, and we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer death."

That verdict to be signed by the foreman.

Or "We, the jury, find that the defendant should be sentenced to life imprisonment." That should be signed by the foreman.

Or "We, the jury, are unable to agree unanimously on punishment." And that should be signed by the foreman.

"The Court instructs the jury that at this phase of the trial conducted for the purpose of determining the sentence to be imposed upon the defendant, the state and the defendant may elect to stand on the testimony and evidence introduced during the first or guilt phase of this trial, or the parties may elect to introduce additional testimony and evidence as to matters relating to any of the aggravating or mitigating circumstances. In reaching your verdict, you may consider the testimony and evidence presented during the first phase of the trial together with the testimony and evidence, if any, relating to any one of the aggravating or mitigating circumstances presented for your consideration during the second or sentencing phase of the trial."

Court Reads Instructions to Jury

"The Court instructs the jury that for this phase of the trial, you shall select from among yourselves a foreman. If you unanimously reach a verdict as to sentence, the foreman shall cause the verdict to be written in the form and manner prescribed in Sentencing Instruction I, and the foreman shall thereafter affix his or her signature to the verdict."

"The Court instructs the jury that it must be emphasized that the procedure that you must follow is not a mere counting process of a certain number of aggravating circumstances versus the number of mitigating circumstances. Rather, you must apply your reasoned judgment as to whether this situation calls for life imprisonment or whether it requires the imposition of death, in light of the totality of the circumstances present.

I have previously read to you the one aggravating circumstance which the law permits you to consider. This is the only aggravating circumstance you may consider. However, before you may consider this factor, you must find that factor is established by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Court instructs that you, as individual jurors, must consider mitigating circumstances. Therefore, even if all other eleven jurors find that a certain mitigating circumstance does not exist, if you believe it does exist, you must find that mitigating circumstance, and weigh it in your further deliberations.

Before punishing Mr. Flowers with death, all twelve of you must agree on such punishment. Each of you must

Sentencing Phase Argument by Mr. Evans
decide the sentence for yourself. In the course of your
deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views
and change your opinion if you are convinced it is wrong, but
do not surrender your honest conviction as to what you feel
the sentence in this case should be, just because of the
opinions of your fellow jurors, or just so that you can all
agree on a verdict."

Ladies and gentlemen, those are the instructions. These are verdict forms that are as described in those sentencing instructions that tells you what to do. And when you reach a verdict, these forms will assist you in preparing that verdict and returning it into court. When you have done so, you can knock on the door, and the bailiffs once again will bring you in to render that verdict. All right.

BY MR. EVANS: May I see the instructions and the forms, Your Honor?

BY THE COURT: Uh-hum.

FINAL ARGUMENT BY MR. EVANS:

Ladies and gentlemen, we are almost at the end of the trial. This has been going on for almost two weeks now. Before I go into this, and I'm not going to be very long; we are going to argue about 30 minutes to the side, and then the case will be yours. But there are a few things that I want to point out. In this first part, I want to go over some of those instructions in a little bit more detail.

But as y'all will remember when each of y'all were sitting up here in the witness chair when we were voir diring the jury, you were told at that point what the procedure in

Sentencing Phase Argument by Mr. Evans the second phase would be, that we would not get to this phase until such time as the jury knew that the Defendant was guilty and convicted him. That has already been done. So we are in the second phase.

This phase now is to try to determine in this particular case what penalty is appropriate. And as the Judge has told you, once we reintroduced all the evidence, everything that y'all have heard and saw in the trial is admissible. All of that is stuff that y'all can take into consideration. Now I'm not going to sit here and try to go back through all that case with you because y'all know what the case was. You just got through with it. I'm not going to sit up here and go back through pictures and diagrams and shoes and things like that. I'm just going to ask that you remember what was in the case.

There are a few things about it though that I do want to point out. Now as we told you to start with, I told you and the Judge told you, and I think Defense Counsel did too; at this phase in the trial what we will be doing, the State will be putting on evidence to justify and show you that in this particular case the death penalty is the appropriate penalty. The Defense will be putting on mitigators, and that is exactly what the Judge has read to you. In this case the aggravating factor that by law you must find is that the Defendant committed this crime during the course of a robbery for pecuniary gain; that he killed these people during the course of the robbery, which is the same thing that you have already looked at on the guilt phase. That is one of the things you have to look at in this

Sentencing Phase Argument by Mr. Evans
case. Now also, as we told you on voir dire, it's not the
fact that well, he killed somebody; he gets the death
penalty. You sat up here and you listened to the evidence.
You know the facts of this particular case, and the facts of
this particular case are what warrants the death penalty in
this case. The fact that four people that had done nothing
to anybody were working, went to work that morning, never
dreaming that they would not get to see their family again,
never dreaming when they went to work, that that would be the
last time they would see any of their friends; four people
that for no reason their lives were taken.

We are not talking about a type situation where two people get in a fight and somebody gets killed. We are talking about a case where an individual takes a gun, goes to a business because he wants some money or is mad, all tied in together; he takes what he wants and he kills people. And I want you to look at how they were killed. I think that is important. These are basically execution type murders. All four of these victims were shot in the head. He wanted to make sure they were dead. This is the kind of stuff I want you to look at. This is why this case demands the death penalty. Four people were killed. He killed them for no reason, the way he killed them, all of that is important.

There are several things -- and I know y'all have sat here and listened to the Court's instructions, and because there are four separate deaths, the Court had to read the basic instructions four different times. But to me, this is the most difficult instruction for a jury to understand that you can have. That's why you need to take your time,

Sentencing Phase Argument by Mr. Evans
look over it, follow it step by step. That's why on voir
dire I asked you specifically if you are picked as a juror,
will you go through the instructions and listen to the
instructions that the Court gives you because these
instructions -- and once you elect your foreman, you can go
through the instructions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

The Sentencing Instruction SS-1A - that is the first instruction on here - it starts out with the procedure of what you are to do when you start your deliberations. The first thing that you must do, you must unanimously find one of four factors. Now those are the same four factors for each case, and I'm not going to go through them for all four cases, but I'm going to go through them. Those factors are on the first page of the instruction. It's four of them right there. The first one, and this is in the instructions relative to Bertha Tardy, that the Defendant actually killed Bertha Tardy. 2: The Defendant attempted to kill Bertha The Defendant intended the killing of Bertha Tardy. 3: Tardy take place. 4: That the Defendant contemplated that lethal force would be employed. Any one of those factors is sufficient to go further. The simplest one is that he actually killed her because all four of them were actually killed. So we would submit that that one pretty well covers them all because that also includes the fact that he intended that deadly force be used and intended the killing. It's not an attempted killing because she was, in fact, killed so 2 really doesn't apply. But all the other three would, but they are all three included in the fact that he actually killed her.

Sentencing Phase Argument by Mr. Evans

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

That's the first thing you do on each set of the You look at those factors, determine which instructions. ones of those apply before you go further. Then it says, "Next, to return the death penalty, you must find that the mitigating circumstances" -- now remember what I told you on voir dire; the mitigating circumstances are what the Defense is putting on to try to justify a life sentence. find that the mitigating circumstances, which tend to warrant a less severe penalty of life imprisonment without parole, do not outweigh the aggravating circumstances." The aggravating circumstance in this case is that the capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the course of a robbery. So if you find in each case that these individuals were killed - that was the factor of the first group - that this was an offense committed for pecuniary gain during the course of a robbery, then unless you find that their mitigating factors outweigh that, you may impose the death penalty.

And that is where we got into the factor the other day about the Court authorizing imposition of the death penalty. You take it step by step. You go through the instructions. Did he kill Bertha Tardy. Was this a robbery? If it is, then if his mitigators don't outweigh that, you can impose the death penalty, and you go further through the instruction. It is complicated, but it's really that simple. The mitigating circumstances that they have given, the Court has given them in this instruction right here, and the Court has gone through them. That he has no history of prior criminal activity; that he has a good prison record with no rules violations; that he follows rules and regulations of

the prison, does as he is told and does not cause trouble for guards; that he has a loving supporting family and many friends; any and all factors relative to the background, life, environment, emotional makeup of Curtis Flowers which would be mitigating circumstances or should be considered - and that is circumstances that you have heard in the record - any other circumstances or combination of circumstances of the crime or of the life and character of Mr. Flowers which you believe should mitigate in favor of a sentence of life.

If you feel like those circumstances outweigh what he did, then a life sentence would be appropriate. If they don't outweigh it, the death penalty is appropriate in this case.

Once you have done that, even before you reach your verdict, on the next page, which is the form, there are findings that the jury is to make. The first part up here under one, "We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Bertha Tardy," and this is where the factors go in that he intended to kill her, in this section right here.

Then you go to the next section. This is where the aggravating factors go in that you unanimously find. "We, the jury, unanimously find the aggravating circumstance of," and you write it in here. Above that it says write in the aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of this instruction that you unanimously agree existed beyond a reasonable doubt. Then at that point if you find that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh that, the foreman,

Sentencing Phase Argument by Mr. Evans if you agree, can sign the verdict imposing the death penalty.

1.0

The penalty in this case is left entirely up to the jury. But that is why I spend as much time as I did on voir dire and the Judge covered this with you too. Each of you told us on voir dire that if the law authorized imposition of the death penalty and the facts justified it, that you could vote for the death penalty. This is a case that the death penalty is appropriate in. I think if you will think about the facts of the case, how this crime was committed, what this Defendant did, the fact that these people didn't do anything to harm anyone; they were just innocent people at work. You can look at all those factors. Look through those factors, and the verdict in this case, I think you will agree, would be, We, the jury, agree on the penalty of death.

The facts in this case justify the death penalty, and you are the ones that make that determination. You are the only ones that can look at that.

Mitigating factors in there: The Defendant has a lot of family and friends. That was true with each of the victims also. This is a terrible case, a terrible crime. Four people were killed. The verdict in this case should be equal to the crime. I think that the jury will make a determination that the only appropriate penalty for the facts of this particular case can be the death penalty.

This phase is completely different than the first phase that you were looking at. In that you had to determine whether he was guilty, look at all the facts of the case. In this case you really don't even have to worry about things

Final Argument by Mr. Evans - by Mr. Carter
like the bullets and the shoes and all that. It just boils
down to one thing: What penalty is appropriate for this
Defendant for what he did? And can these mitigating factors
that they have brought to your attention outweigh the fact
that he deserves the death penalty?

Like I told you, I'm not going to be long up here because y'all have heard it all. I do ask that you consider what I have said to you. I ask that when you do go back in the jury room, you return the appropriate penalty in this case in all four cases of the death penalty. And each of these cases, just like when you were back there on the guilt phase, each of these has a separate set of forms. You have got to fill out the forms for each one of the counts that he has been convicted on because he is looking at all four of those as far as sentence also.

(State's Counsel confer.)

BY MR. CARTER: May I proceed, Your Honor?

BY THE COURT: Yes. You are through, aren't you

Mr. Evans?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes.

FINAL ARGUMENT BY MR. CARTER ON SENTENCING PHASE:

Good afternoon. Early this morning a lady stopped me and told me she thought I needed to apologize to somebody, and it stunned me, even probably shocked me. And because I have a warrior nature, I backed up and said, "Get away from me." Now I don't think I did anything to apologize, that warrants apologizing. I certainly didn't do anything to anybody knowingly, but if I did something to any of you and I need to apologize, then I apologize as well as to anybody

Final Argument by Mr. Carter else.

Now you had this hard job to do, and so did I. And you went back and you deliberated. You stayed back there for two and a half hours, so I know you deliberated and you thought about it, your job, and you didn't do it automatically. And I thank you for that. I notice when the family of the victims were on the witness stand and telling their stories, many of you cried, and that is understandable. And I would bet that you thought of the victims' families as well as your own families.

But I would also bet that not many, if any, thought of Mr. Flowers' family. Mr. Flowers' family are victims too, not victims in the same manner, but victims too. Had they been able to stop this, I'm sure they would.

When I was nine years old, a little girl knocked my books off my desk, and I picked them up neatly and put them back on the desk, and she did it again. I picked them up again and put them back on my desk again. She did it again. She did it five times. By that time I was enraged, and I wanted to hurt her. And her big sister got between us so that I couldn't get to her. And I'm not proud of this, but I tried to kill her big sister so that I could get to her. But I never could, so I beat the girl up. And the teacher came in, and I was so enraged that I wasn't even afraid of the teacher. The teacher hit me, and I snatched the switch from her, and said, "Don't hit me again." They sent me to the principal's office. I was still enraged. The principal pulled out a knife, and I still wasn't afraid. Looking back, I acted inappropriately because I was nine or ten. I didn't

Final Argument by Mr. Carter have sense enough how to act. I hadn't learned. I hadn't been taught.

When the schools were integrated, I had to change schools, and about ten of us were taken and placed in this class with all white kids, and all the other black kids were put in this one class. And I was told I couldn't compete, but we ten were told we couldn't compete with the other kids in our class. Within a short period of time not only was I competing, I was beating them. And I was called names, but I didn't get mad and go and get revenge. I believe in the power of love and redemption. Great things have happened as a result of love and redemption.

There is a song that has some lyrics. There is a -- (Pause) that say anybody with a heart can love me. And if you can love me, you can also love Mr. Flowers despite what he is accused of. We don't know what love is. God had to tell us one time. He told us in I Corinthians 13, 4 through 8. Love suffers long, is kind; love endeth not; wanteth not itself; is not puffed up; does not behave itself unseemly; seeketh not our own; is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil; rejoices not in the evil but rejoices in the truth. Bears all things, believes all things, hopeth all things, endures all things.

The incident with the girl and with the school taught me that an eye for an eye, tit for tat, tooth for tooth, doing to others as they have done to you is not proper and not Christian. Anybody who thinks killing a person who has killed somebody else will give them any relief or closure -- I think and this is just my opinion -- is

Final Argument by Mr. Carter misguided and devoid of the true meaning of life. It's your happiness, your closure, your peace; this is just my opinion.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, personal opinions.

I don't think, are appropriate for closing argument from either side.

BY MR. CARTER:

I'm talking about the decision of life and death.

If you believe Mr. Flowers killed these people, that is fine; you have said that. But I bet you if Mr. Flowers did it,

Mr. Flowers did not go down there to Tardy Furniture Store and stay there nine days trying to decide if he could kill those people or not. If he did it, he snapped, and it happened suddenly. He didn't have a time to cool down, to change his mind.

We have been here nine days, and we know why we have been here. And we know what the decision has to be, one or the other. You never have to vote for death. You never ever have to vote for death. I don't care what they say, and I know I'm right and they know I'm right. Death should be a last resort, and it should be for the worst criminals on earth, and Mr. Flowers is not one of them. Mr. Flowers is not Adolph Hitler. He is not Timothy McVae. He is not Osama bin Laden, and he is not Ted Kezinsky. How is jail without the possibility of parole is too good for Mr. Flowers?

Jim Aiken, our expert, said - a very talented man I might add - said that Mr. Flowers do good in prison. He didn't think Mr. Flowers had any future dangerousness. Mercy alone is enough to vote for life instead of death, and we ask for mercy. Maybe you think Mr. Flowers didn't show any, but

Final Argument by Mr. Carter - by Mr. de Gruy you can show some if you want to. The decision is yours, and you have had nine days to think about it.

I know death is a hurtful thing, and unfortunately, it happens to every single one of us. But nobody wants to go like that, and I understand that. I lost two of my brothers. Somebody killed two of my brothers and one of my uncles. And I didn't seek punishment from either because I knew punishment wouldn't do me any good. It may do somebody some good whose life is some kind of way, I guess connected to whether the killer dies, but my life is not connected that way. My life, I feel, and I feel the life should extend beyond an individual regardless of how much we love them. But if you think death is appropriate and it's going to bring closure and peace and joy and do these people any good and you some good, then vote for it.

Finally, what we do, how we respond when faced with arduous circumstances defines who we are. Thank you.

FINAL ARGUMENT ON SENTENCING PHASE BY MR. DE GRUY:

Good afternoon. Nobody has ever disputed that four very fine people were killed on July 16, 1996. We have never disputed that. We certainly understand the suffering of the family. The only dispute we had was who was responsible for those killings. I can imagine the thoughts that were racing through your mind as you listened to that testimony this morning from the State. I will tell you; I was thinking of my father who I lost when I was 16. And I think about that a lot now because I have a 12 year old son, and he is my only son. And on my desk I have a double frame; I have a picture that was taken of my father and I at my first communion. And

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy
we took the exact same pose with my son and I, and they are
together and framed on my desk. I know you have all had
those kind of experiences in our life. I'm not unique, and I
understand that. And I was touched just like all of you as
you sat here listening. You have to be.

But what do we do with that testimony now?

Fundamentally, I believe that we are not a people of vengeance. We are a people of justice, tempered with mercy. It is almost inhuman to put you in this position of how you evaluate this kind of evidence. It's -- Mr. Evans was right. It's not like what you heard at the first phase. How do you deal with this, in the giving of the instructions of law -- one, two, three, and you know you can't do that as a human being. And it's a struggle. I don't envy your task. It's a struggle I don't know how you are going to deal with. But each one of you have been given that task, the task of determining the appropriate punishment.

Yesterday's verdict, the decision was made. He will be punished, and he is going to be punished severely no matter what you decide today. He is going to die in prison. Will he die when the State of Mississippi says so, or will he die when God says so? That decision has been forced on you. I can't tell you enough times how really unfair I think that is, that we have done that to you. But that is how our system works. That is our how our country works. It entrusts decisions like this, not to lawyers and judges, not to government officials; we trust it to you. I know we were here for four days to get to this jury. None of you were volunteering for this job. I am sure when your name was

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy called, you were perhaps looking around wondering how come me. I am sure there is not one of you who wouldn't rather be somewhere else today. But this is your task.

The State of Mississippi cannot put Curtis Flowers to death without each one of your consent. Each one of you has to give permission. Curtis' life is about to be put in your hands. The question is, is it necessary? Do we have to? Do you have to take his life? I think the answer is clearly no. We don't have to. It's not necessary. He will be removed from society forever. It's not a second chance. He is not being let off light. If you vote for life, it means life without parole, the only option you have.

We all recognize the horrendous tragedy on July 16. This community has lived with it since that day. It is not going to change after today. I suspect that most of you knew the extent of this tragedy. None of you were surprised by what you heard this morning. You can imagine; you knew that four people had been killed. You knew that when you walked in, and you knew that when you took the witness stand and we questioned you. You assured the Court; you assured all of us at that time that you would not automatically vote for the death penalty even knowing that four innocent people were killed. At the time you knew that there had been a robbery, and you said, I'm going to consider other factors. I want to know more if I'm selected for this jury.

We talked in the abstract back then. Now the Judge has told you; this is something for you to consider. You are authorized to consider. And that is as far -- and the Judge was straight up with you last week. He told you that's as

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy far as I'm ever going to go. It's up to you, each one of you. You absolutely do not have to do it. It's solely your decision.

that has been presented, what you know about this case, that you can, you can put one thing on death side of the scale. He tells you it's a weighing process. We talked about weighing. It doesn't help a whole lot when, how you attach weight to these things, but the only thing you can put on death side of the scale is the aggravating circumstance, the circumstance that you knew about last week -- there was a killing for money. The Court has told you in the instruction -- and you will have those with you -- that's what you can put on death side of the scale. You have to balance that with everything about Curtis' life, his basic humanity, not just what you have found that he did on that afternoon or that morning. That's what it comes down to.

You have to put those, human life on one side of the scale and the robbery for money, the killing for money. You have got to look again because the Judge tells you again you must find beyond a reasonable doubt. And again, you deliberated a very long time yesterday, and the Court has instructed you. You had a night to sleep on it. That is something you have to look at again. If you don't find that one circumstance, your duty is over. If you don't find that today beyond a reasonable doubt, your instructions are clear; you just report that to the Court. We talked about it last week, and the Judge has now instructed you. It can be anything about Curtis' life you can weigh on the other side

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy of that scale.

And as I was talking to many of his family and friends and we were trying to figure out who best and what the best cross section of his, of the people he has touched in his life to come forward, it was a difficult task. How do you know about circumstances of someone's life in just a few brief moments from their friends and family? I don't know that I will ever feel like I have done enough.

Mr. Flowers' father came here as the spokesperson for his family, his mother, his brothers, and sisters. He told you about how close they were, how close they were to Curtis; how Curtis would go out and help neighbors, not because he was sent out there, because he just wanted, somebody needed leaves raked. An elderly man needed to be shaved. And of course, he shared with you the great passion in the family for singing, the time they spent singing gospel music together.

Supervisor Forrest came to tell you about his relationship with Curtis and how he tried -- and I think Mr. Carter was referring to if somebody could have stopped this, a man like Mr. Forrest would have if he could have. Tarryon Daniels is a life long friend, played ball with Curtis, fishing. They worked together for years. He is also a singing partner. He used to sing with Curtis.

Kittery Jones is his cousin, and they grew up together. They were more like brothers. Kittery himself is not a singer, unusual in the family. He just enjoyed the listening to the music, listening to Curtis sing.

Then we brought in a man who is an expert in

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy Corrections because I think you need to know. I think these are concerns you should have, where we are sending this man. Will somebody else be in the picture? He told you over 30 years of experience dealing with the penitentiary systems all over the country his involvement in every aspect of corrections. He told you about how Curtis has conducted himself. We didn't talk about during the trial, and many of you knew about the prior trial. We didn't talk about it, and we asked those of you who knew about it to set it aside, but you know now that he has been incarcerated since January of 1997. Most of that time he has been on, in maximum security, close security being watched 24/7. Mr. Evans was asking well, doesn't that keep-- doesn't that make him act right? And was inferring that at Parchman, unlike every other penitentiary in the world, everybody gets along well. We all certainly know that is not true. We know the problems in prisons.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

The point he was making with the 24/7 was you can't get away with anything. Yet Curtis had zero rule violations. He is making an effort to stay out of trouble. He told you a little bit about the environment, how unusual that is, that he would expect 30, 40, 50 violations. Zero violations. It's a seven year period.

Mr. Evans said well, you know, someone who did this, don't you think they would be a danger based on the thousands and thousands of classifications. He said no, and unlike most of his classifications, he did interview in this case because it's an important decision you have to make, and you should have as much information as

Final Argument by Mr. de Gruy possible.

You heard about what the rest of Curtis' life will be like. You know no matter what, which sentence you choose, there is no more basketball with friends, no more fishing with his father, helping mom and his neighbors. Will Curtis ever be able to share his beautiful God given voice? I hope so. Not for him. But like Kittery told you, just the pleasure to hear him sing. I will concede that as a maximum security inmate, it's unlikely that he will be given that opportunity. I don't suspect that they would do that. But I have hope. There are not many of us who sing well. Kittery admitted he didn't, and I can tell you I can't sing at all. But when I stand in church and hear those truly blessed parishioners around me who can sing, that inspires me. I get that gift; it's not for them. We shouldn't take that gift away from all of us no matter what.

The State cannot take Curtis Flowers' life unless each one of you individually, and the instruction is clear on that, unless each one of you individually make the decision to tell them that they can do that. You don't have to choose death. It's not necessary in this case. Not vengeance, but justice tempered with mercy. It's what we are asking for. I'm not ashamed to ask for it. Another death is not the answer in this case. Like Reverend Latham said, it's time to begin the healing. It's what we agree on. It's time for life.

I have to sit down, and Mr. Evans will be back up here. I'm just begging you, spare my friend's life. Thank you.

Final Argument by Mr. Evans FINAL ARGUMENT BY MR. EVANS:

A few more minutes and this case will go to y'all. There are a few things I want to talk about. Who was there to beg for mercy for the four people that got killed at Tardy Furniture? Opposing Counsel wants to argue to you that the Defendant snapped; it was just a split second thing. How do you snap when you plan and carry out steps of a crime? How do you snap when you walk from your house and get the gun and walk back to your house? How do you snap when you then walk from your house to the store and take the time to deliberately shoot four people in the head and then take the time to take the money out of the cash drawer? That is not snapping.

You are not here to forgive. That is what you have been asked by the Defense to do. You are here for the purpose of determining what penalty is appropriate for Curtis Flowers for what he did. That is what your job is. That is what you have to do. Opposing Counsel wants to say well, he needs to be in prison so he can sing and he can do all these things. These four victims never committed a crime in their life, but don't you think their family would like --

BY MR. CARTER: --Your Honor, I object to that-BY MR. EVANS: --for them to be able to be in
prison--

BY THE COURT: -- Overruled.

BY MR. EVANS:

Don't you think they would like to be able to hear them sing? They don't have that option.

Opposing Counsel says oh, you can lock him down in

Parchman in maximum security, and he is not too dangerous when he is being watched over there. The whole purpose of what we are here for is the facts of this case. Look at the case and look at what he did. The facts justify the death penalty. If you will look at the facts, you will make that determination. This case justifies the death penalty because of what he did.

As we covered with you on voir dire, there are only certain cases in Mississippi that the death penalty is even appropriate. This is one of them. And this isn't just one death; this is four deaths. Four separate people's lives were taken for no reason.

I'm not going to waste y'all's time by standing up here any more because y'all know from the facts of the case what is there. This is not a case that can be decided on anything except the law and the facts. Unless you find that these mitigating factors that they are telling you outweigh the aggravating factor and what he did, the death penalty is appropriate in this case. As I told you that I would do on voir dire, I told you then that I would be asking for the death penalty, and that is what I am asking you to do. I am asking that you go to the jury room. You go through the form that the Judge gives you, fill it out, and return a verdict on each of the four counts of death because that is the appropriate penalty in this case. You will find that from going through the evidence.

That's all I have, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it is now time for y'all to retire and consider these options.

_

Jury retires to consider verdict

As I told you, there are four verdict forms, one for each count. When you have reached a decision in each of those counts, then you should fill out this form in accordance with these instructions that I have given you, and knock on the door and return it back into Court. You can go to the jury room. There will be some-- we are going to deliver the exhibits and stuff to you so you will have them for your deliberations.

JURY RETIRES TO CONSIDER SENTENCING VERDICT AT 2:50 PM.

BY THE COURT: Let me see y'all up here just one second.

(CONFERENCE AT THE BENCH WITH THE JURY OUT:)

wasn't, I guess I just missed it and y'all did too when you were going through the instructions. The State's Sentencing Instructions A, B, C and D that I read to the jury, all of them had the same language except D, which on this it did not for some reason or other, after "life imprisonment" did not have "without parole." All the others did, and everything else has it. I would like to interline that.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yeah, I think that would be fine.

BY THE COURT: Without parole.

BY MR. EVANS: No objection. I think you found out earlier in the week none of us can read anyway.

BY THE COURT: Well, I just proved I can't.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Clyde, you caught everything else. How did you miss that?

V	er	d	i	C	

BY THE COURT: Okay.

(THE JURY WAS DELIVERED THE COURT'S INSTRUCTIONS

AND THE EXHIBITS THAT WERE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE. THE COURT

WAS IN RECESS AWAITING THE VERDICT. UPON THE JURY'S KNOCK AT

3:49 PM, COURT WAS BROUGHT BACK TO ORDER, AND WITH ALL

COUNSEL AND THE DEFENDANT PRESENT, THERE WAS THE FOLLOWING:)

BY THE COURT: The jury has indicated that they have a verdict?

BY THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: All right, the jury has indicated that they have a verdict at this phase of the trial. I say once again what I said yesterday. I will not tolerate disruptions in this courtroom, whatever the verdict may be on this phase of the trial. The Sheriff is directed to take into custody anybody that does so disturb this courtroom or, in fact, this courthouse. All right. You may bring them in.

JURY RETURNS TO THE COURTROOM.

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, have you reached a verdict on each of the counts in this case?

BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Is it, is each verdict on the sentencing phase, the verdict of all twelve of you?

BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Would you hand the verdicts to the bailiffs?

(Verdicts handed to the Court and then to the Clerk.)

BY THE COURT: The Defendant will rise. Read the

Verdict

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

verdicts, ma'am.

BY THE CLERK: "Your verdicts should be written in one of the following forms: We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Bertha Tardy. List or itemize all facts found, if any, from the list under Section A of this instruction which you unanimously agree exists in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. That the defendant actually killed Bertha Tardy. We, the jury, unanimously find that the aggravating circumstances of: Write the aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of this instruction if you unanimously agree it or they exist in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the" excuse me, "the course of a robbery. Exists beyond a reasonable doubt and is sufficient to impose the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstance and we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer death." Signed foreman of the jury. Verdict form. "Your verdict should be written in one of the following forms. We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Robert Golden. List or itemize all facts found, if any, from the list under Section A of this instruction which you

Verdict

28

29

unanimously agree exists in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. That the defendant actually killed Robert Golden. We, the jury, unanimously find that the aggravating circumstances of: Write the aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of this instruction if you unanimously agree it or they exist in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the the course of a robbery. Exists beyond a reasonable doubt and is sufficient to impose the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstance and we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer death." Signed foreman of the jury. "Your verdict should be written in one of the following forms. We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Carmen Rigby. List or itemize all facts found, if any, from the list under Section A of this instruction which you unanimously agree exist in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. That the Defendant actually killed Carmen Rigby. the jury, unanimously find that the aggravating circumstances of: Write the aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of this instruction if you unanimously agree it or they exist in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the course of a robbery.

Verdict

1 2 3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Exist beyond a reasonable doubt and is sufficient to impose the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstance, and we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer death." Signed foreman of the jury.

"Your verdict should be written in one of the following forms. We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder of Derrick Stewart. List or itemize all facts found, if any, from the list under Section A of this instruction which you unanimously agree exists in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. That the defendant actually killed Derrick Stewart. We, the jury, unanimously find that the aggravating circumstances of: Write the aggravating circumstances presented in Section B of this instruction if you unanimously agree or they exist in this case beyond a reasonable doubt. The capital offense was committed for pecuniary gain during the the course of a robbery. Exists beyond a reasonable doubt and is sufficient to impose the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstance and we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer death." Signed foreman of the jury.

BY THE COURT: Do you want the jury polled? BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.

	Jury Polled
1	BY THE COURT: Ma'am, are all of these your
2	verdicts?
3	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
4	BY THE COURT: How about you, ma'am?
5	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
6	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
7	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
8	BY THE COURT: You, sir?
9	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
10	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
11	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
12	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
13	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
14	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
15	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
16	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
17	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
18	BY THE COURT: You, sir?
19	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
20	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
21	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir?
22	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
23	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
24	BY THE COURT: You, ma'am?
25	BY A JUROR: Yes, sir.
26	BY THE COURT: Okay, I find that the verdicts ar
27	unanimous. Mr. Flowers, you have now been convicted

of four counts of capital murder, and the jury has now sentenced you to death on each count. By law, those

[1996
1	Trial Adjourned verdicts are automatically appealed to the Mississippi
2	Supreme Court. I appoint the Office of Capital
3	Defense to represent you on that appeal. You are now
4	remanded to the custody of the Sheriff pending that
5	appeal.
6	Ladies and gentlemen, at this time I'm going to let
7	y'all go back to the jury room for just a minute, and
8	I then will have some instructions for the rest of
9	you.
10	DEFENDANT IS ESCORTED FROM THE COURTROOM.
11	BY THE COURT: Anything further from the Court?
12	BY MR. EVANS: Not from the State.
13	BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor.
14	BY THE COURT: Court is adjourned at this time.
15	TRIAL WAS RECESSED ON FEBRUARY 12, 2004.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	

(ON MARCH 16, 2004, COURT WAS OPENED IN WINONA, MISSISSIPPI, FOR A HEARING ON POST TRIAL MOTIONS. PRESENT REPRESENTING THE STATE WERE HONORABLE DOUG EVANS AND HONORABLE CLYDE HILL. PRESENT REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT WERE HONORABLE ANDRE DE GRUY AND HONORABLE STACY FERRARO. THE DEFENDANT WAS ALSO PRESENT:)

BY THE COURT: Are we ready to proceed?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: This is cause number 2003-71,
State of Mississippi versus Curtis Giovanni Flowers.

It is before the Court on a motion for new trial,
Mr. Flowers having been convicted of capital murder on
February 11th, 2004, and on February 12th, 2004, being
sentenced to death by the jury. All right, Mr. de
Gruy.

additional evidence to present at this time. We have filed the Motion for New Trial, a three page motion which we believe fairly sets forth the objections we made at trial. And with all respect to the Court's orders at trial, we would ask that they be reconsidered. In particular, that the issue on the strikes, the Batson strikes of the jurors in this case; that again reminding the Court of the -- the Court made a prima facie finding of discrimination. And in that so the record is clear, one member of the jury was African-American, in this county which is 45 percent African-American. Every single one of the

State's strikes were against African-Americans, and again, our specific objections that there were white jurors who were similarly situated to African-American jurors who were removed. I believe we have clearly made our record at the trial on that. We would ask the Court to again reconsider that ruling in addition to the points we raised in our motion. We have again no additional evidence to present at this time.

BY THE COURT: Okay, I have got a couple of questions I need to ask.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes.

BY THE COURT: Okay, in number four on the Motion for New Trial, you ask that all motions that the Defense filed should have been granted. Do you have any specific motions that you are talking about?

BY MR. DE GRUY: We filed 32 motions or reraised 32 motions, and there was a pretrial hearing on those motions.

BY THE COURT: The reason I ask that is I think most, the vast majority of those were granted, and I'm trying to really understand which ones, which one that I denied that you are objecting to. A lot of them were stock motions.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Right. The motion -- we filed a motion on two of the cases for a speedy trial, Motion to Dismiss for Speedy Trial. They had never been prosecuted since 1996.

BY THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. DE GRUY: And the Court overruled on that.

BY THE COURT: I will adopt my ruling on that one.

BY MR. DE GRUY: We had moved to invoke the rule prior to voir dire, and the Court denied that.

BY THE COURT: Okay, I rely on my ruling there too.

BY MR. DE GRUY: And this motion was also again made at trial when it became apparent in the jury selection that the State was relying on the NCIC reports. We had -- the Court denied us our request for any NCIC reports that they ran, and they clearly did run some.

BY THE COURT: Okay. On that particular motion, has the State got a response?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: I mean on that issue, excuse me.

and does not have NCIC run on all jurors. That is not something that we can do. In this particular case after looking at the questionnaires and the ones that stated that they had criminal records and ones that didn't, there were a couple that law enforcement thought had criminal records. They did run NCIC reports. They were furnished to me. I think there were two that I had that didn't answer. One of those people, even though they had not answered it on their questionnaire, admitted to the Court during initial questioning that they were a convicted felon. So that one was not necessary. The only one of them that I

Post Trial Motion Hearing

had that was relevant was one that completely denied, even after the Court's questioning, that he had ever been convicted of anything, and I brought out on voir dire with him that I had a copy of his NCIC report showing that he was a convicted felon, was convicted -- I think it was in Cook County, Illinois, and at that point he admitted that that was true.

But to start with, we only had a few, and it was ones that were specifically run that had, law enforcement had a reason to run. It is something that is not discoverable. It is only used for the purpose of trying to determine if someone is a competent juror. And in this particular case that did, in fact, possibly save a mistrial on this case because we were able to eliminate someone that was apparently trying to sit on the jury that had a criminal record. So it's not run on all jurors. It is something that we had on a couple, and we made it be known to the Court what we had on that juror.

BY THE COURT: Any response to that?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes. As far as the jurors that we know they used them on, we know and I believe the District Attorney has acknowledged that they did run others. I think that what they ran, the Court needs to see what they ran, and I think it also ties in with the entire jury selection process and particularly, if all the jurors that they ran NCIC's on were African-American. We don't know because they are refusing to disclose the NCIC's that they ran.

1.5

1.7

1.8

BY MR. EVANS: I think I have answered that, Your Honor. We did not--

BY THE COURT: -- I think you just said you did.

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: His answer, if I can understand it correctly, is the ones that he did run he furnished. The ones, the rest of them he didn't run.

know of are ones that had either admitted that they had criminal records -- the ones that law enforcement had some reason to believe had a criminal record. And the whole purpose of this, as this Court is well familiar, a case that I had in Attala County. We ended up with a convicted felon on the jury. My argument then was that that would be of benefit to the defense, not the state, but the Supreme Court reversed the case because that juror did not answer.

So our benefit is not necessarily for jury selection, but it's to make sure that the Court doesn't end up with somebody on a jury that may be a convicted felon. Anyone that came back that had a record that we had we would definitely have to furnish to the Court because we don't want somebody sitting as a juror that would cause a mistrial.

BY THE COURT: I will adopt my ruling on that, the ruling denying it. Okay.

BY MR. DE GRUY: That's the extent of the pretrial motions that were ruled on at the December hearing.

BY THE COURT: Okay. All right, the next one is the motions that I granted for the State which should have been denied. What specifically are you talking about there?

BY MR. DE GRUY: (Pause) I don't have a motion, Your Honor, that they made a formal motion.

BY THE COURT: Okay. The next one is number six. You are talking about the jurors who were excused for cause that should not have been excused. What particular jurors was that?

(Pause while Mr. de Gruy looks through jury lists.)

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, while he is looking, from my memory, the only ones that were struck for cause were on the Court's motion. The only ones that the State moved for cause I don't believe that the Court agreed to excuse.

BY THE COURT: Well, most of them that were excused for cause were both sides agreed that they could be excused for cause.

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir. But any that the State just specifically asked for cause that were not agreed on, I don't think the Court granted my motion on any of them. I think there were about three that I asked to be struck for cause, and I don't believe any of them were.

matter of whether they were removed on his motion.

The fact that they were removed for cause -- and I'm looking for the juror's name.

BY THE COURT: Well, that is part of your motion is though is that it was on his motion that I excused some for cause.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Or on the Court's.

understand that. Most of them that were excused for cause were after they got on the stand and admitted among other things that they could not be fair and impartial or that they had an opinion. After most of those -- I would say 95 percent of them or better -- both sides put in the record that they had no objection to them being excused for cause. So I'm just trying to find out which ones we are talking about.

(Pause while Mr. de Gruy looks further through his jury lists.)

BY MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, I apologize. I cannot find a juror unless I have another strike sheet. I thought I had consolidated them all.

there were very few that were excused for cause that y'all did not both sides agree that they should be excused for cause. As I recall, most of them was because they said they couldn't be fair and impartial or -- well, and there were some on the death penalty question obviously. Those two things took out most of them. Not knowing which jurors you are talking about, I will have to adopt the ruling that I made at the time of the trial as being the ruling of the Court on

Post Trial Motion Hearing
this particular mo
it's the same way
you asked that the
BY MR. DE GRU
BY THE COURT:
Number eight is on
just been over tha
nine is about limi
are you talking ab
BY MR. DE GRU
11 jurors about their

this particular motion on that issue. I would assume it's the same way on number seven on the ones where you asked that they be excused?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: --for cause. Okay, same ruling.

Number eight is on the NCIC reports. I think we have
just been over that, and I have ruled on that. Number
nine is about limiting voir dire. What in particular
are you talking about there, Mr. de Gruy?

BY MR. DE GRUY: I was attempting to question the jurors about their consideration of mitigation. It was, I believe, specifically during -- no, it was whether or not the juror could consider mitigation. The juror was -- I removed him for cause ultimately, but I wanted to question him further to develop the Witherspoon, the reverse Witherspoon, Morgan strike on this juror. He was -- we objected at the time to being limited in our questioning of him.

BY THE COURT: Okay. That is to one particular juror?

BY MR. DE GRUY: It was-- yes. The questioning was on a specific juror.

BY THE COURT: Okay, then the Court finds that that issue should be overruled simply for the fact that you excused him for cause. Or there may be other reasons--

BY MR. EVANS: -- I think--

BY THE COURT: --and I probably ruled on that during the-- in the transcript. I don't know exactly

which juror we are talking about, but if you excused him for cause, I don't see where there is any prejudice there.

Okay, the next one is on the <u>Batson</u> issues. I think that issue has been developed extensively.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I would like to make something clear in the record on number ten, if I may.

BY THE COURT: Okay, the first thing let me say is the original jury of twelve was ten white and two black. The next day -- and I have the record here before me. Those twelve were seated, I believe on Wednesday; is that right?

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: They were seated on Wednesday. And by agreement of all parties, we agreed to come back the next day and seat the alternates, but to go ahead and get twelve seated which we did. Mr. Booker was one of those. As the record reflects, and I think having looked at it, I think it adequately reflects the situation that occurred. He contacted the bailiff. The bailiff contacted me, and overnight he determined he could not be fair and impartial. He had made up his mind as to the guilt or innocence of Mr. Flowers, and his opinion was that he was innocent and no evidence was going to change his mind. He indicated he could not be fair to both parties in that case. So we dismissed him and seated the alternate, and that left one black juror on the jury. The alternate that was seated was a white female. And

2

1

4

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Post Trial Motion Hearing

y'all can put anything in the record you would like on that. I think that reflects what happened.

BY MR. EVANS: The Court has covered what I wanted to cover for the record.

BY THE COURT: And I have read the record, and I think the transcript itself adequately provides a record as to what happened. I think that was the proper procedure. In part -- I just think it was proper. The other thing is I think in Jenkins v. State, which is a case that was my case in Attala County; Mr. Evans was the prosecutor. We had a situation where we seated thirteen, but it was the wrong thirteen. One that wasn't called sat, and one that was left. And we didn't find out until the middle of the trial, and it was a mistrial, and we had another trial on it. And the issue was raised as to how that procedure should have been done. The Court held that we should have, that maybe shouldn't have done a mistrial, but it was not error. But what the proper procedure was was to seat the alternate. That's what we did in this case. So I think we followed, and I think there is precedent for what we did, although I think it was the only avenue for us to go at that time.

And as to the record as to the <u>Batson</u> challenges, the prima facie part of the <u>Batson</u>, the race neutral reasons and the rebuttal, I think there is an adequate record on all that. I think my rulings on that are correct, and I adopt those rulings.

3

1

2

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Number 11 about the rank speculation from Dr. Hayne. I don't know what you are talking about there.

BY MR. DE GRUY: He testified that an injury to Ms. Rigby could have been from defense posturing or a fall. And it could have been either one, and he had no way of saying medically, certainly not within a reasonable degree of medical certainty what caused the injury.

this Court I can't tell you how many times. He has testified in cases I have been involved with for fifteen or twenty years, and he is adequately qualified to make those, to give those opinions. It is within his expertise, and it's not speculation. And there was no -- there is nothing in the record really where he was attacked as to whether that was expertise. So that is overruled.

Expert testimony concerning shoe comparisons from an unqualified witness.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I would ask to be heard just briefly on that one.

BY THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. EVANS: If I understand what this motion is, it's about the officers saying that they looked at everybody's shoes. This is something we are not talking about two of the same type of shoe and pinning down where there are any little differences in it. We are talking about completely different types of shoes,

flat sole shoes in relationship to tennis shoes, things like that. This is not something that would require expert testimony. It was offered as lay opinion. None of these witnesses were offered as experts, and under my interpretation of what the law is now on expert and non-expert testimony, this is not something that should have required expert testimony. It was lay opinion, and each of these people had a sufficient amount of information presented to the Court to allow their testimony as to their personal knowledge and personal opinion.

BY THE COURT: Mr. de Gruy. Is that what we are talking about?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor; that is.

BY THE COURT: Okay. I find that anybody could make those opinions as to what type of shoes, what a shoe sole looked like and whether it looked like the imprint. That would be within almost anybody's ability to make, to give that opinion, so that is overruled.

Which hearsay testimony from Sheriff Thornburg?

BY MR. DE GRUY: He testified concerning, that

Doyle Simpson told him that his gun was stolen. It's actually contradicted by Mr. Simpson's testimony that he didn't make a complaint that his gun was stolen.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, the best I can remember, that went in basically as him explaining why he went to Angelica. It was to investigate the fact that a gun had been stolen. It was not anything that

Post Trial Motion Hearing

was even introduced for the proof of the fact, just to show why he was there and what he was doing there at the time. Plus Doyle testified, he said the gun was stolen. But as far as the way it came in from the Sheriff, it was to explain why he was down there.

BY THE COURT: Okay, it was just a report. In any event, Doyle Simpson testified subject to cross-examination on that issue. So that is overruled.

On the admitting the enlarged gruesome photographs, really my ruling is pretty clear on that. One, I do not find that the photographs were illegally, were photographs that were so gruesome as to the point where they could not be admitted at trial. There were a limited number of photographs compared to what the State had. The fact that they were enlarged, I think, is of no consequence. I think they could have been enlarged and admitted without admitting the little ones, and I think in effect, it was better for the jury to understand, gave the jury a better basis of understanding the scene with the enlargements than the small ones. So that is overruled.

The next one is on my ruling on the lady when she gave her opinion about the popularity of the Grant Hill Filas.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, on that, I would like to make clear, and I know this is in the record, but I would still like to make the point that the Defense

Post Trial Motion Hearing

was allowed to go into how many of these shoes had been sold statewide, worldwide. They were entitled, they were allowed to go into all of that. And I don't see that they were limited in any form or fashion on that.

BY THE COURT: Mr. de Gruy. Any response?

BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor.

that that type testimony, that the popularity of that shoe was irrelevant. The ruling was that her opinion as to whether they were popular was irrelevant. One, to give a lay opinion, she must give some kind of basis for that opinion, but in addition to that, there had already been a lot of testimony about the popularity of the shoe, and her opinion as to the popularity of it is irrelevant. But as a 403 ruling, it is ruled as cumulative at that point in time.

All right. The next is on the uncorroborated and unreliable testimony of Odell Hallmon. That was sufficiently covered at trial in that there was a cautionary instruction given twice, once when he testified, once at the end. There was another instruction also given at that time, I believe, when he testified. Anyhow, the Court required that his criminal record be told to the jury at that time, so they had all that information. The case law is sufficient on that that I think that is admissible testimony. It is up to the jury to decide whether to believe it or not.

The 404 question raised in 17, I don't know which one you are talking about.

BY MR. DE GRUY: That was the testimony in Mr. Hallmon's testimony.

BY THE COURT: There was no limiting instruction for a witness.

BY MR. DE GRUY: There was no limiting instruction to his testifying concerning -- the substance of his testimony, he brought out other crimes evidence, alleged that Mr. Flowers had committed other crimes or bad acts. There was no limiting instruction to that.

BY MR. EVANS: What other -- I don't understand what other bad act he is referring to, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: I don't recall that either.

that he was asked to help the Defendant make up a statement. To start with, as this Court is well aware, but for the record was a defense witness in Flowers II. In this case he admitted that he lied in Flowers II which we were not, did not go into that with the jury. We just went into the fact that he had agreed with the defense to make up a version about what happened. And all of that is related to this particular crime. It's not another crime.

BY THE COURT: Is that what you are talking about?

BY MR. DE GRUY: The Court, the allegation that Mr. Flowers suborned perjury in attempting to get him

Post Trial Motion Hearing

to give false testimony. The Court ruled that that was admissible, and the Court ruled that that -- as the notes I have, that the Court said that was part of a plan. That was the exception that it went under, and there was no objection-- no limiting instruction given to the jury on that. That is basically 17, what we are raising in number 17.

BY THE COURT: Okay, I'm going to adopt my ruling at trial on that.

Okay, number 18. The question about the polygraph examination, I mean it wasn't a question, but the response from Odell Hallmon on the polygraph, as I recall, was an unsolicited response from him. But it was done on cross-examination. It was not done by the State. And it also did not -- all that said was there had been one. It did not say what the results were. I do not find that to be error.

Object to the battery receipt with no connection to the case. I believe the relevance of that was the time on that battery receipt, was it not?

BY MR. DE GRUY: That was what our objection was. The receipt was dated after the crime.

BY MR. EVANS: Which battery receipt? Are we referring to the batteries, Your Honor, that were purchased by Mr. Collins on the day of the crime, or are we referring to the receipt for the batteries that were dumped off the vehicle? I don't know which ones we are talking about.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Only one battery receipt was

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Post Trial Motion Hearing introduced into evidence. The battery receipt received by Tardy Furniture for the batteries that were allegedly broken by Mr. Flowers.

> BY MR. EVANS: And that was relevant because this That is is the batteries that started the whole case. the batteries that he dropped off the vehicle and admitted in his own statement that he dropped off the vehicle and that the money was being held out of his check for.

BY THE COURT: Right, and I think that was my ruling. If not, it's what it is now.

What does -- what are we talking Number 20. about there, Mr. de Gruy? The last witness.

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes.

BY MR. EVANS: Your Honor, in response to that, there was nothing about victim character brought out with him. This witness was important because no one had shown what time that victim went to work. We were trying to show what time he went to work. The only thing that he brought out is that they had spent the night together, what time he brought him to work the next day, and who he saw there when he brought him. Ι think Mr. Golden was present when he brought him there. It's for a time factor. It also shows and explains to the jury this is the only witness that did anything to explain to the jury why there really were no photographs of him, that he did live for a while. He explained approximately how long he lived, where he was during that time, and he said he visited him in

the hospital while he was still living. So it was necessary for a time factor and also to explain, help explain what Dr. Hayne followed up with about why that autopsy was done later and there was some medical intervention. We could have brought in local doctors and nurses to go through all that. But for saving time, we didn't go into all that, and he was the only witness that we even put on that explained that he was in the hospital here.

BY THE COURT: Anything else?

BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor; we don't.

BY THE COURT: The Court found at trial and finds now that it had some relevance in relation certainly to the time in which he was, when Mr. Stewart arrived at the business. In the overall scheme of things, probably it had that probative value, but other than that, didn't have a whole lot of probative value but had no prejudicial effect. That was the 403 ruling that the Court had.

In the surrebuttal issue, the rules don't necessarily allow surrebuttal. It's within my discretion to do that. It has to be when new matters are brought up, and I found that that did not happen in this case, so that's the reason I did not allow surrebuttal. I also don't find that the Defendant was prejudiced by that. I do find that the Defendant was not prejudiced by that.

I don't understand number 22.

(Off the record while Mr. de Gruy looks in his

2

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Post Trial Motion Hearing
notes.)

by MR. DE GRUY: Your Honor, it was during the testimony, yeah, the testimony of Connie Moore, and the objection was to the phrasing of the question to Ms. Moore which implied -- let me make sure. The question was after Curtis killed them or he came there after Curtis killed them. It implied in the question guilt. There was an objection made to that. (Pause) And that's the notes I had on that question. We made an objection; it's on the record.

BY THE COURT: And I overruled the objection?

BY MR. DE GRUY: And you overruled the objection.

BY THE COURT: Okay. I will adopt the ruling I made at the time that was done, and it was in relation to the testimony of Connie Moore; is that right?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: That would direct somebody's attention to what we are talking about; right?

BY MR. DE GRUY: Yes, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Okay. On the victim impact evidence, you made your objections at trial on that. I think my ruling was correct on that, and I adopt that ruling. Where did I limit you on mitigation?

BY MR. DE GRUY: We sought to question a witness who had sung with -- Tarryon Daniels. He had sung in the choir with Mr. Flowers, and I believe the State's objection was that it would be somehow execution impact because this witness -- the point was, of his testimony was how Curtis interacted with this singing

Post Trial Motion Hearing

group and the effect he had on his singing group in his life, not how in executing Mr. Curtis, Mr. Flowers would have on the singing. But if he simply -- we were attempting to elicit testimony that he gave up the singing group and quit singing because he couldn't sing without Mr. Flowers, that he had lost that either way, no matter what the jury was going to do. We weren't attempting to show any type of execution impact. We were simply trying to show the effect that Mr. Flowers had on the people around him. And the Court didn't allow me to ask that question or let that answer be made.

that that the Court didn't allow, Your Honor. The only thing -- and I can't remember specifically. I think the only objection, and we didn't have much to say to or about any witnesses that they put on in mitigation. I think there was one question asked about what impact his death would have on a singing group which is improper, and we objected to that. But we didn't object to anything that they wanted to put on about his life and things like that. That's the only thing that I can remember that we even objected to other than the so-called expert. I think we had an objection on that. But I can't remember anything that he is talking about.

BY THE COURT: I don't recall it either. I will adopt whatever ruling I made at trial on that, and say that too I not only didn't limit it, I allowed the

Post Trial Motion Hearing expert to testify, and that may have been stretching the rules there.

On the instructions, the instructions are what they are, and I have ruled on those, each one at trial. Your objections, Mr. de Gruy, are I think adequately preserved in the record, and I think the jury was adequately instructed. In fact, I am confident they were, so that part of it is overruled.

The Court not only has examined the motion, heard the arguments of Counsel, but has examined certain portions of the transcript in relation to some of these issues to make sure of exactly what I ruled, and after doing that, the Court finds that the Motion for New Trial has no merit and is therefore overruled.

Mr. Evans, you should prepare me an order to that effect.

BY MR. EVANS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Anything else?

BY MR. DE GRUY: No, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Okay. Court will be in recess.

TRANSCRIPT CONCLUDED.

FILED

APR 1 4 2004

JULIE H. HALFACRE, CIRCUIT CLERK

BY_____D.C.

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY

I, Mrs. Linda F. Burchfield, Official Court Reporter for the Fifth Circuit Court District of the State of Mississippi, do hereby certify that to the best of my skill and ability, I have reported the proceedings had and done in the trial of STATE OF MISSISSIPPI V. CURTIS GIOVANNI FLOWERS being No. 2003-0071-CR on the docket of the Circuit Court of MONTGOMERY County, Mississippi, and that the foregoing 2017 pages plus table of contents contain a true, full, and correct transcript of my stenographic notes and tape taken in all of said proceedings.

This is to further certify that I have this date filed the original and one copy of said transcript, along with three 3.5" electronic disks of said transcript in ASCII language, for inclusion in the record on appeal with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of MONTGOMERY County, Mississippi, and have notified the attorneys of record, the Circuit Clerk, and the Supreme Court Clerk of my actions herein.

I do further certify that my certificate annexed hereto applies only to the original and certified transcript and electronic disks. The undersigned assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of any reproduced copies not

1	COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE CONTINUED
2	made under my control or direction.
3	
4	This the 14th day of April, 2004.
5	
6	
7	11. 1 -7 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
8	Linda J. Burchfield
9	
10	LINDA F. BURCHFIELD, C.S.R. 1019
11	Official Court Reporter
12	46 Still Water Circle
13	Eupora, Mississippi 39744
14	
15	COURT REPORTER'S FEE FOR
16	TRANSCRIBING THE WITHIN
17	INCLUDING TABLE OF CONTENTS OF 29 PAGES \$4,096.00
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	FILED
26	July in 2 2004 files
27	D'LIE H. HALFACRE, CIRCUIT CLERK
28	BYD.C.